

58
Partiality Detected:

OR, A

REPLY

To a Late

PAMPHLET,

ENTITLED,

*Some Proceedings in the Convocation, A.D. 1705.
Faithfully Represented, &c.*

DISCOVERING

*The many Partial Representations, and Unjust
Reflections, contained in the said Pamphlet:*

PARTICULARLY

*As to what concerns the Proceedings of
the Convocation in IRELAND.*

L O N D O N:

Printed for A. and J. Churchill, in Pater-noster-row.
M DCC VIII.

Partially Decayed

THE
PAMPHLET

Some Text
The following is a list of the
names of the persons who
have been appointed to
the various offices of the
Society of Friends in
the year 1840.

Wm. D. G. ...
...
...

T H E

P R E F A C E.

THE Preface to these Proceedings, which I shall endeavour to represent a little more *faithfully* than the late Publisher of them has done, begins with a Passage out of Mr. *Vargas's* Letters for the reviving of Provincial Councils; which will not, I believe, to any one that looks into the Letter it self, appear to be much to the Publisher's Purpose. That Author writes while the *Council of Trent* was sitting, and carrying Things in another way than he liked: He was very sensible of the need there was of a Reformation, among the Clergy especially, and saw no hopes of it from that Council; and therefore wished for the Celebration of such as were Provincial: *which would, he says, among other effects, prevent secular Princes being brought under the Necessity of meddling with things, to the Violation of Ecclesiastical Immunities; in which, if some Remedies are not found out for their great Necessities, and some holy and lawful Courses for the obtaining of Justice, they cannot forbear concerning themselves.* But I hope there is neither of these Occasions amongst us, for pressing the holding of Provincial Synods concurring with every Session of Parliament, as this Writer would have it; that neither the State of the Church nor Clergy is so bad as to require it, and that there is no occasion to guard against the Secular Power, which by the Excellence of our Constitution has a just Share in these Matters.

The Preface.

And if I should also observe, that there were no Presbyters in *Vargas's* Provincial Councils, I hope I should not be thought to be either against Provincial Councils in *England*, or that Interest which the Presbyters of this Church have by the Legal Establishment in them.

The Archbishop and Bishops, and the Presbyters that have acted in due Subordination to them, desire nothing but the Preservation of our Legal Establishment, and have Opposed nothing but what they believed was irregular, either in it self, or in the manner in which it was Pursued. They conceive, that the Honour and Use of Provincial Councils can only be secured by the orderly Celebration of them, and that the Antient Forms and Usages which have been continued down, are the Rules for the orderly holding of such Assemblies. They are as apprehensive as this Writer or his Friends can be, of the hurt that is done to the Church and Religion, by the Divisions of Clergymen, and hope they have not been the occasion of any. What this Writer says of his Friends, may much more truly be said of them, *That they could not possibly make greater Advances than they did toward Peace, without betraying the Trust that was reposed in them, and giving up every thing without Distinction that was demanded.* And as I will appeal to the impartial Reader for this, when he has perused this following Answer; so this Writer must own, that all his Pretences for Peace must stand or fall with the Merits of the main Cause; with this difference only, that a less Evidence will support the Bishops in the Exercise of common Episcopal Rights, than will support the Clergy, in the demand of that which Presbyters do not ordinarily enjoy in Episcopal Churches.

I do not say this, that I think the Bishops have need of this difference; for I am perswaded the Rules and Usages of our particular Constitution are apparently with them, and that the Presbyters have no Foundation in these for their particular Claims. But they who have by degrees been let into a greater Share in the Administration of the Church than they anciently had, by granting their Subsidies, a Civil Occasion that has been some time at an end; should use that Interest with Modesty, to the upholding of the Order

The Preface.

Order of the Church, not to the weakning the Government of it.

Tho' I hope the State of Religion was not altogether so bad about eight Years ago as this Writer describes it, yet no doubt it was such as to make it highly reasonable for all the Ministers of it to unite in the best manner they could to promote its Honour and spread its Influence wherever they came. But I fear this has not been the Effect of meeting in Convocation, as things have been ordered; and the Blame must lie at their Doors, who have made this Disturbance.

This Writer tells us however, that when things were in this sad Condition, *there were great Expectations from the Provincial Assemblies of this Church, which as he says began to be regularly celebrated after a long Intermiſſion of them.* I do not know whether these Expectations have been more disappointed by the assembling of this Province, or by the sitting still of the other; but it is certain the Province of York has done nothing as yet in this Work, nor so much as met for this Purpose, as gravely as this Writer informs us that the *Provincial Assemblies* of this Church began to be regularly celebrated about eight years ago. I cannot learn that the Convocation was ever so much as opened at York, with Prayers or a Sermon, or that any Prolocutor has been chosen, or that this Writer or any of his Friends have ever complained of this *long and still continued Intermiſſion.*

But for ought that has hitherto appeared, it might have been as well for the Church, if we had been as quiet in this Province; unless we could have met to better Purpose, and they who made such a noise for Convocations, would have been contented with the established Usages of them. If they had acquiesced in these, which according to this Writer *had been to have given up every thing without Distinction which was demanded, He much questions whether they had been after all nearer to the End which they aimed at.* It is pity however that they did not try; which would have enabled them at least to complain with more Justice that nothing was done, than they now can. For I am persuaded that no one who reflects impartially on what passed, will think that the Clergy did so manage their Affairs as to encourage either the late King or her present Majesty to put them upon Business, or the Arch-
bishop

The Preface.

bishop and Bishops to intercede with either of these Princes for such a Commission.

And therefore it is very disingenuous in this Writer to conclude, *that the Disputes between the two Houses were not the true Cause why they did no Business, but rather that the Resolution taken to prevent their doing Business was the real and only occasion of their Disputes*: and it is so much the more so, because it is imputed to those, who not much above eight Years before, were thought by the Majority of the Lower House too forward in Business, tho' it was then laid duly before them.

But as disingenuous as this Conclusion is, this Writer does not make it *with any View of raising new Jealousies*. He had, good Man, much rather be instrumental in healing old ones, and will not despair but somewhat may be done towards the accomplishing so desirable a Work by the approaching Convocation. A Committee of both Houses that met with sincere Intentions, would not be long in finding proper Expedients, and he prays God to infuse into the Minds of all who are Members of that venerable Body an unfeigned Love of Peace, and Wisdom to discern the right Paths that lead to it. He best knows with what View he made this Conclusion; but as it is but a Jealousy, so surely it could not be for the healing of old ones, nor has he either in his Preface or Book written so as to induce any wise and good Man to believe that it was his Design. In his Book he hopes and believes that there is not one of the subscribing Members who hath changed his Opinion in these Points, and they who have not altered their Opinion, we may, he says, be satisfied will not alter their Conduct, nor tamely yield to such Measures as may end to the ruine of the Clergies Rights and Liberties, and the Subversion of our antient Constitution. He had given us the Opinion of the Subscribers as to the Rights and Liberties of the Clergy in their own Paper of Claims a little before, in which they say they are firmly resolv'd by all lawful means to maintain them to the uttermost. I think this is enough to make any one else despair of seeing any healing Measures pursued by these Persons in this next Convocation, or any proper Expedient proposed by those, who are resolved to maintain all they have claimed to the uttermost, and seem to think the Paper of the two Irish Members an

irresistable

The Preface.

irresistible Proof of the Justness of their own Pretensions, as this Writer expresses it.

With as little Grace does a Prayer for Peace come from one, who at the same time was doing so much against it, as must I believe appear to every one that will be at the Pains of reading the following Paper.

I have taken things in the Order they lay, both in his Preface and Book, and have endeavoured to shew, with all the Brevity and Plainness I could, that the Facts referred to in both, are in many Particulars very greatly misrepresented, and that the things attempted by the Majority of the Lower House have not been for Peace. The Representation which this Writer has given us of them, after above two Yerrs chewing upon them, is, I confess, so extreme Artificial, and wrought up with so many guarding Expressions, where there was any room for them, in Preparation for a Defence if he should be called to account, that it has taken up a good deal of time so to detect the Partiality of it, as to make it evident to those who are Strangers to our Proceedings.

But I verily believe, that even such will see through all his Disguises, That he has not followed Truth in the Accounts he has given, and that neither he nor his Friends have laboured for Peace: That the Archbishop and Bishops, and many Members of the Lower House acting with them, who are charged as the Disturbers and Hinderers of it, have made real Approaches toward it, and managed the Disputes that remained, with a decent Regard to those that opposed them: And that on the other hand, the Patrons of the Lower House Claims have fallen very short of that Respect they owed to their Fathers and Brethren in the manner of treating this Controversie, and advanced every new Convocation, in their Pretensions and Practices, upon them; and to support their Pretences, have brought in at last an Evidence from *Ireland*, which has as little Relation to *Right*, as it has Tendency to *Peace*.

I am not aware that I have expressed my self so as to mislead my Reader in any particular; and tho' I will not for all this pretend to say there is no one Mistake in my Paper,

The Preface.

Paper, as much Care as I have taken to avoid making any ; yet I do promise, that if this Writer, or any one for him, does shew me any such Error, I will readily retract it ; as I desire nothing, but that the Truth should be known. But if this Writer, or any of his Friends, should treat this Answer with Scorn and Disdain, without making any fair Reply to the Arguments and Facts it contains, as has been formerly done ; I shall not think my self obliged, to take any notice of so unsincere and haughty a Writer.

THE

The CONTENTS.

THE Publisher of the Account, under Pretence of Peace, revives a Dispute that had rested for some time.	p. 2
Uses Reproachful Language.	p. 3
The Verbal Conference insisted on, not a proper way to end the Dispute	p. 4
The Motion for a Committee in order to it, came from the other side, and was defeated by this Writer's Friends.	p. 5
The printed Expedient proposed no Peace on lower Terms than all that the Lower House claimed.	p. 7
The putting the Prolocutor in the Chair before Confirmation, no way to Peace.	p. 9
Nor the Application to the Upper House.	Ibid.
Two reasonable Propositions made by the Upper House, reject- ed.	p. 10
The separate Application to the Queen, aimed at Victory more than Accommodation.	Ibid.
The entering upon Business, till the Methods of Proceeding were set- tled, the way to greater Confusions; especially when the Business enter'd on was unfit or impracticable.	p. 11
More done to suppress Ill Books by the Bishops, than by the Lower House.	p. 13
The publishing of their Grievances, without mention of the Arch- bishops Answer, an Injury to the Upper House, and the Church in general.	p. 16
The Substance of the Archbishops Answer.	p. 17
The Paper of Complaint, Dec. 1, 1704, a farther Injury to the Upper House.	p. 18
The Lower House in 1586, kept other Measures with the Upper.	p. 20
This Paper is published the third time, without any Notice of the Observations made upon it in the Upper House.	p. 22
The Charter for Propagation of the Gospel, neither granted to su- persede the Care of the Convocation, nor owing to any Motion in it, as this Writer injuriously suggests.	p. 23
The Presenter of the Prolocutor in 1705, did in his Speech breath something else than Peace.	p. 26

The Contents.

<i>No Sermons before the Lower House of Convocation in 1661, upon Jan. 30. May 29. or Nov. 5. tho' the Offices for those Days were settled in that Convocation.</i>	P. 27
<i>Very good Reasons for publishing the former Account of this last Convocation.</i>	P. 29
<i>That Account censured, but not disproved.</i>	P. 31
<i>This Writer does not give a fair Account of the Difference about the Address.</i>	P. 32
<i>Declines taking notice of the Observations made in the Upper House upon this Occasion.</i>	P. 34
<i>The Application of our Saviour's Words to the Bishops, as giving a Stone for Bread, &c. irreverent and groundless.</i>	P. 36
<i>The Protestation vindicated.</i>	P. 38
<i>More decent than the Complaint made against it.</i>	ib.
<i>The Bishops rudely and unjustly charged with Partiality, &c. in receiving the Protestation.</i>	P. 39
<i>And for declining a Reference to competent Authority, by those who paid no Regard to that Authority when it did interpose.</i>	P. 41
<i>Her Majesties Letter to the Archbishop.</i>	P. 42
<i>Objections against the Protestation in point of Form, answered.</i>	P. 44
<i>Protesting by Proxy, no Absurdity in Convocation.</i>	P. 45
<i>As allowable as declaring by Proxy.</i>	P. 46
<i>That, no singular Case, in which the Proxies were used.</i>	P. 47
<i>No difference between Persons who have Suffrages in their own Rights, and those that represent others.</i>	P. 50
<i>Bishops, by Virtue of their Cimmendams, may as properly act by Proxy, with one side of the Lower House as with the other.</i>	ib.
<i>The State of the Controversie very well known by those who had not been of the House.</i>	P. 51
<i>Several of the Complainers in no better Circumstances of being acquainted with it, than some of the Protesters.</i>	ib.
<i>The Protestation not designed to hinder Business.</i>	P. 52
<i>The Unity of the Synod a proper thing to be insisted on.</i>	P. 54
<i>The Church of Ireland no proper Exception to the Observation that the Presbyters of this Church have greater Privileges in Provincial Synods, than in other Episcopal Churches.</i>	P. 55
<i>The Declaration of Rights considered.</i>	P. 57
<i>Dissenting finally to the Address of the Archbishop and Bishops, a great Instance of Disrespect to them.</i>	P. 58.

The Contents.

<i>This Writer has no great Reason to boast of the number of his Subscribers.</i>	p. 59
<i>Reverence for the Episcopal Character best shewn, by paying all due regard to the Bishops.</i>	Ibid.
<i>Innovations unduly charged on the Bishops.</i>	p. 60
<i>Prorogations for a Month, during the Session of Parliament, no Innovation.</i>	p. 65
<i>Nor the pretending to a Jurisdiction over the Lower House.</i>	Ibid.
<i>A Letter concerning the Convocation in Ireland.</i>	p. 67.
<i>No Lower House Books in Ireland.</i>	p. 68.
<i>Great Pains taken in Ireland to suggest the Danger of the Church before the Convocation met there.</i>	p. 69
<i>The Account given by Mr. Percivale and Mr. Higgins, was without the knowledge of the Bishops or Clergy of Ireland, tho' four of the Bishops were in London.</i>	p. 70
<i>The Clergy of Ireland found themselves to be no Convocation by their being summoned, elected, and returned, upon the Præmunientes Clause.</i>	p. 71
<i>The Provincial Writs were not executed in Ireland.</i>	p. 72
<i>The Upper House in Ireland refused to treat with the Lower, till they rectified the Irregularity of chusing a Vice-Prolocutor without their leave.</i>	p. 73
<i>The Lower House desires the Upper to declare such of the Clergy as did not appear, Contumacious.</i>	p. 74
<i>The Actuary of the Upper House declares in the Lower, that he is commanded to intimate that this Convocation is adjourned, &c.</i>	p. 76.
<i>The Bishops in Ireland defer answering the Papers of the Lower House, do it at last in general Terms, refuse to admit the Lower House, oblige them to retract their Answer by the Virger.</i>	Ib.
<i>The Clergy of Ireland are weary of attending to no purpose, and return home.</i>	p. 77
<i>But do not reproach the Bishops as obstructing Business,</i>	p. 78
<i>The Account of Mr. Percivale and Mr. Higgins examined by the Clergy in Ireland, and approved in a thin House.</i>	p. 80
<i>Disliked by the Bishops.</i>	p. 93.
<i>The present Practice of one House in Ireland without any Precedents there, not fit to be urged here, where we have Registers before us.</i>	p. 94
<i>No Appearance of a Convocation in Ireland. in the reign of H.</i>	

The Contents.

<i>Nor in Edw. VI. or Queen Eliz. Reign.</i>	p. 96
<i>Nor till the 13th of June 1. 1615, when it did not meet with the Parliament nor give any Subsidy.</i>	p. 97
<i>The next Convocation met the 10th of Car. I. about the time of the Parliament and gave Subsidies, Archbishop Usher presiding in Right of the Primacy of Armagh.</i>	p. 98
<i>No Act Books of Convocation in Ireland appear till 1661, in which Convocation, they sat by virtue of the Provincial Writs only.</i>	p. 99
<i>The Convocation of Ireland opened in a different Manner from that of England.</i>	p. 100
<i>The Acts of 1661 not fairly cited by the Author of the Parliamentary Rights, &c.</i>	p. 101
<i>The Lower House in 1661 chose not their own Actuary, till they had leave of the Upper to make such Choice, which is afterwards confirmed by the Upper.</i>	p. 102
<i>The Prorogation of the whole Convocation made in the Upper House, is so entered, as to shew the Clergy were included in it, and determin'd by it.</i>	p. 103
<i>Several things done in the Name of the Synod by the Bishops only.</i>	p. 104
<i>The Bishops put off the Consideration of things proposed by the Lower House, without being complained of.</i>	p. 105
<i>A Convocation of four Provinces different in many things of that of one, and made more different than should have been by the distinct Prorogations of the several Archbishops upon the Royal Writ.</i>	p. 106
<i>The Account of Mr. Higgins and Mr. Percivale seen in Oxford, before it was offered in the House.</i>	p. 107
<i>Reasons to think that the Practice in Ireland, as well as the Account of it, was formed here.</i>	ib.
<i>A Bishop in Ireland apprehended this Influence, before the Convocation sat there.</i>	p. 109
<i>This Writer of a different Spirit from Mr. Hooker, in treating Matters of Ecclesiastical Policy.</i>	p. 112

The Reader is desired to correct the following Errors of the Press.

PAge 3. l. 11. read known. p. 9. in the Margin, read Upper. p. 22. l. 1. dele in. p. 26. l. 18. read known. p. 29. l. 28. read the. p. 36. l. 12. dele not. p. 38. l. 17. dele new. p. 41. l. 35. read 7th. p. 47. l. 21. read singular. p. 49. l. 18. for read as he. p. 50. l. 10. after weight, read in the Protestation. p. 97. l. 13. after sees, add of. p. 100. l. 20. read their. p. 106. l. 7. instead of the first before, read by.

Partiality Detected :

O R,

A Reply to a late Pamphlet,

ENTITLED,

*Some Proceedings in the Convocation, A. D.
1705. faithfully Represented, &c.*

THE late Account of *some Proceedings in the Convocation, A. D. 1705.* with the *Pre- face* before it, is written with such great Professions of regard to Truth, and Desire of Peace, at the same time that it charges the Archbishop and Bishops, and their Friends in the Lower House, with the greatest Opposition to both; that such Readers as are not much acquainted with these Matters, cannot but be at some Loss how to form their Judgments about them; if they are not born down by it to think the Bishops and all on their side, without more ado, in the wrong.

And tho' the general Conduct and Character of the Persons thus represented, are so well known, that they might be left to stand the Attacks of this over-bearing Asserter of whatever he is pleased to advance without any other Defence than what has been amply offered already; yet because this Pamphlet is written with so

B

strange

strange an Assurance, as if nothing of that kind had been done, and so much time has passed since there was, that the Books may be out of Mens Hands, and the things not much in their Minds; it will not, I hope, be thought to proceed from Contention, if this Author's Pretences be a little examin'd, and so much of the past Dispute recollected, as is necessary to give a just view of the present State of it.

*His Pretences
examin'd.*

How strictly he has kept to that Truth, of which he has said and quoted such excellent Things, will best appear in the Course of the Account here proposed, compared with that he has given us; and what Title he and his Friends have to be looked on as the Seekers of Peace, the following Observations will serve to inform us.

P. 2.

He says, *They were sensible of the sad Consequences with which such printed Appeals to the Publick were attended, of the Mischief they did to Religion, of the Disgrace they brought upon the Order, and of the Opportunities they gave to the Enemies of both, not only of sporting themselves with our Divisions, but of carrying on the Cause of Infidelity more successfully and securely.*

The first Account in the Narrative published by this Writer's Friends.

And yet, not to go back so far as the *Letter to a Convocation Man*, and *Dr. A's Rights*, which prepared the Clergy for Disputes; He cannot but remember that the first *Account of the Proceedings of the Lower House of Convocation* at large, was published by his Friends, in the *Narrative*, 1701, which, in their first intermediate Session April 9. they ordered to be prepared for the Information of the Clergy of the Province, before the *short Letter to a Friend in the Country* about those Proceedings came out; as that *Letter* was occasioned by the imperfect Accounts that had been given, in several private Letters, before. And now without any new Provocation, when almost a Year and a half had passed since any thing was written on the Subject of these Disputes, and two Years and a half since any of the things he now writes of were done; and when according to the Catalogue his own

Bookseller



Bookseller gives us, the last Paper came from his own side, if not from himself; He makes a new Appeal to the Publick, not upon the Matter last under Debate, but ripping up things from the very beginning, and turning them upon the Archbishop and Bishops, and many of the Lower House, with all the Acrimony that is familiar to him.

He says, *That presently after the opening of the first Convocation, a servile and unprecedented Attendance upon the Upper House was exacted from the Lower, and an implicit Surrender of their own Rights; and that the Innovations of the Upper House kindled this Flame, and were resisted with great Temper and Calmness by the Lower, while an eager and fierce Opposition was made to their innocent Claims; and that the Dispute was kept up on their Parts purely out of Zeal to preserve the Constitution of an English Synod, which they saw Endangered, and were very apprehensive, that the taking these Outworks was endeavoured in order to farther Attacks, and intended to facilitate Schemes, which could not be executed or owned, till those Persons were effectually subdued, who, by reason of their known Principles and Characters, were most likely to stand in the way of them.*

Pref. p. 2.
Hard Words
not the way to
Peace.

Lib. p. 22.

A multitude more of such kind of Expressions might be brought out of this as well as the former Papers on that side of the Question, which are not I think the Words of them that are endeavouring to make Peace. Let us see whether the other Actions they boast of as directed that way, have been any better Steps toward it. This Author does not seem to set out very well upon such a Business, when he says he believes the sincere Lovers of Peace and our Order will not be displeased with the Recital of them; when one would think that the sincere Lovers of Peace ought to be at least as well affected to the Episcopal Order: no doubt they should be to both in that Subordination which the Constitution of the Church does require. But to let that pass and come to his Instances.

Pref. p. 3.

The first is the Request that was made and repeated with great Earnestness for the adjusting the matters in Dispute by a Verbal Conference, March 31. 1701.

Verbal Conference not a proper way of ending this Dispute.

Letter to a Friend, p. 6. col. 2. Hist. of Convocation, p. 105. Synod Ang. p. 138.

This Request, as they call it, was made instead of giving an Answer in writing (which they finally refused) to a Paper the Archbishop and Bishops sent down, drawn up with great Care, from comparing the Registers of former Convocations, and referring to many particular Entries; but as they have been told more than once, that a Verbal Conference was no way proper for settling a Difference that was to be decided by a strict examining of antient Records, so Appeal is still made to the Judgment of every indifferent Person, whether the Archbishop and Bishops did not propose the most suitable Method.

Had it been really doubtful which was the properest Course, I believe it will be still found wholly new for the Inferiour Clergy peremptorily to refuse a Method of treating proposed by the Bishops, and as peremptorily to insist upon a way of their own, not agreeable to the Sense of the Upper House.

The Precedent he brings for it from the Convocation of 1661. December 12. is nothing to his Purpose. The Prolocutor with two or three other Members desire to be admitted to confer with the Bishops, and were accordingly admitted; but it was to confer about a Matter which they had appointed the Prolocutor but two Days before to consult the Lower House about, viz. Some Emendations in the Office of Communion that had been brought immediately into the Upper House, over and above what had been brought up from the Lower: And this Consultation is managed not after the manner of a Verbal or free Conference, but *Dictus Prolocutor presentavit Domino Prasidenti, & tradidit in manibus suis nonnullas Papyri Schedas, Emendationes &c. concernentes; quibus perlectis & habitâ consideratione diligenti desuper & approbatione earundem, dictoq; Prolocutore dimisso, idem Prasidens*

fidens contin. Surely this does not make for the Clergy's insisting to dispute with the Bishops about the Metropolitcal and Episcopal Rights in a manner contrary to what the Archbishop and Bishops propose to have them considered in, nor can such insisting be urged as a mark of their Inclinations to *Peace*; if it may, one can never pretend to know what is *making ready to Battel*.

The other Instance he mentions of a Conference in 1689. was taken notice of in the Archbishop and Bishops Answer to the Lower House Paper, *April 5. 1701*, and was a Conference to which the Lower House was called by the Upper, but without any such Effect, as should encourage them to prefer that Method of treating to a Correspondence by writing, which allows more room for considering, and is not subject to such misrepresentation, as a Verbal Conference is.

The next Attempt for Peace which he boasts of, as *The Attempt made by his Friends, was trying to compose things by a Committee of Sixteen, February 9. 1701.* Upon which it is to be observed in the first place, that this Motion for an Accommodation was not made by them, but by the Reverend Dr. *Beveridge* the late worthy Bishop of St. *Asaph*, on the side of the lesser Number in the Lower House, who had at that time signed with them the *Protestation*, which the then Dean of *Peterborough* offered to the House against the Irregularities of their Proceedings; and particularly against their adjourning the House but the Session before, without any Regard to the Authority of the Schedule. So that whatever Tendency to Peace there was in this Transaction, its Rise is owing to the Motion of a Member that opposed their Claims, and its Progress chiefly to the Concurrence of those who were then prepared to have protested against them; and who are owned by the Author of the *Faithful Account*, to have proceeded with great Temper and Decency in the Debate about it. The Inclination of the smaller Number in the Lower House to Peace in the Conduct of this

for Peace by a Committee in 1701. not owing to this Writer's Friends.

Present State of Convocation, in answer to the Faithful Account, 4to. 1702. p. 8.

this Matter is further evident from this, that at the Committee they consented to such a wording of the Propositions of Accommodation, as several of them expressed their Dislike of at the time; apprehending that use would be made of them to the Diminution of that Authority, which they had just before professed under their Hands they would carefully maintain. But the whole Proceeding being begun upon a Foot of only finding out a way of going on in *Peace without settling the Right*, they let them pass. And this they had hardly sooner done, than this Author's Friends boasted of an Advantage they had gotten, and thereby put the Members who had agreed to these Propositions upon a necessity of making a Declaration of the plain Sense in which they agreed to them. This Declaration, perfectly agreeable both to the Occasion and Business of this Committee, was ready to have been offered to the House the next Session immediately after the Report; the making of which was prevented by the Sickness and Death of Dr. Woodward the Prolocutor, and the Dispute that follow'd upon it; not by any Design of those Members of the Lower House, whom this Author unjustly charges with it: as may be seen more at large in *The Present State of the Convocation*, refer'd to above.

The De-
feat of that
Attempt ow-
ing to him
and his
Friends.

Had these Members had any such secret Intentions, which the Declaration they were ready to make shews they had not, it had been easie for the Majority to have defeated it, by only acquainting the Archbishop and Bishops of the Deputation of the *Dean of Christ-church* to supply the Prolocutor's place, and desiring their Approbation before they put him into the Chair: And this, which was promised by some Members, might have been done without any prejudice to their supposed Rights; as they had not yet attempted to put the Prolocutor himself into the Chair, before Confirmation.

If these Propositions of Accommodation, taken in the fairest sense of those that agreed to them, were thought so good an Expedient for Peace by this Author and his Friends, why were they not renewed by them at the opening of the next Convocation? which would have shewn who were most for healing our present Divisions. And I will beg leave to ask the Author and his Friends, if they are still willing to proceed by those Propositions, understood as the Declaration above-mentioned explains them? or, if he can in justice expect they should be admitted without that Construction, while they were represented without doors as giving up the Cause of the Archbishop's Authority?

But before I proceed to consider what they pretend to have done for Peace in the next Convocation, I must just take notice of the Paper which this Author mentions as printed with the same healing Design, under the Title of *An Expedient*. This Author himself observes, that two Pamphlets soon came out to shew the Absurdity of that Paper; and I need only add, That they did shew it effectually, and receiv'd no Reply. All that I shall therefore observe in this place, is, That it charged the Archbishop and Bishops with being the sole Authors of this Dispute, in Expressions very hard and reflecting, That, by way of Expedient, it proposed to oblige the Clergy to adjourn themselves to the same Day with the Upper House, provided his Grace would be pleased to keep to the accustomed Adjournments of once or twice a Week, or thereabouts. Another Article is, That the method of sending a Schedule may continue to be the way of Intimation, for the future, to the Lower House, as to the Day and Hour to which the Upper House is adjourned, and the Prolocutor shall intimate that House to be adjourned to the same Day and Hour, the Clergy consenting thereto, when their Debates are at an end.

Their Expedient no Method of Peace.

P. 13. C. 2.

P. 17. C. 1.

But the Archbishop's Adjourning (as they love to speak) for a Month, tho' at the Approach of a Solemn Festival, and

and when no Synodical Business was before the Convocation, which was the Case refer'd to, did, in the opinion of the Author of the *Expedient*, make it necessary for the House to assert their Right of meeting on intermediate Days. And not to have done it, had been to have given up all. And yet he cannot help supposing it questionable whether the Lower House have ever regularly met Synodically on intermediate Days, and done Business as a House, when the Upper House hath not sat.

P. 15. c. 2.

P. 13. c. 2.

P. 22 c. 1.

I may leave it to any Man to judge whether this Author propos'd an equal Expedient, or whether the Writer of this last Account could fairly mention it as such, when in the same Paragraph he says, *No Expedient was offer'd by those who ridicul'd this, on any other Foot but that of an absolute Submission to the pretended Authority of the Archbishop and Bishops.*

How truly he says this, will appear as we go on; but I think it is evident at present that no other Expedient was offer'd in this Paper on any other foot, but that of admitting all the Pretensions of the Lower House.

Let us then go on and see what Advances were made by the Lower House in the next Convocation, which met after Her Present Majesty ascended the Throne, and when, as this Author says, *that Alteration of Circumstances induced the Lower House to believe that a new Experiment toward Peace might be successfully made.*

I shall not enquire upon what particular Grounds the Lower House, who had no reason given them to doubt of Justice before, were induced to believe that this Change did so much favour their Desires of Peace; but shall only consider the Method in which they pursued their peaceful Design.

And so much has been written already about this particular matter in the *Account of the Proceedings between the two Houses of this Convocation*, to which nothing has as yet been objected, that it is almost needless

to say any thing here: However, that I may not wholly refer the Reader to that former Account, I will make an Observation or two upon the Representation which the Writer gives of the Case.

He says, *The first thing they did after the Confirmation of the Prolocutor, was to beseech their Lordships to suggest some Method for the ending of this Controversy; but he does not tell us what they did before the Confirmation of the Prolocutor, which was putting him in the Chair,* Putting the Prolocutor in the Chair before Confirmation, no way to Peace. even before any one was nominated to present him; a Practice contrary to the Rule and Usage of former Convocations, and not attempted in these later, till this favourable Opportunity they thought they had of bringing things their *own way* into a method of Peace.

But surely this was a very strange Introduction to such a Design, as was then, and still is, pretended; and could not but give the Members on the other side, just reason to question the Sincerity of those Professions of Peace, which were at that time so industriously made by the Patrons of the Lower House Claims.

Nor did the *Application* to which this Writer refers Nor the Application to the Lower House. us as an eminent Instance of their good Disposition, give a much better prospect of Peace than that extraordinary way of setting out at the first. For it lays it at the door of the Archbishop and Bishops, that these Matters were not already adjusted, and prays that they would again take the Questions in Dispute into their wise and paternal Consideration, especially that concerning the Right of the Lower House to hold and continue their Assemblies in the intervals of the ordinary Prorogations of the Convocation made in the Upper, on which, as they conceived, the being of the Lower House subsisted.

I believe nobody could see, in such an Application as this, any signs of an Inclination in the Persons that made it, to be satisfied with less than yielding their Claims. Had Peace been their real Intention, the two Proposals which the Archbishop and Bishops sent down, had not
C been

The two Proposals from the Archbishop and Bishops, tending to Peace, rejected by the Lower House.

been rejected then, as not answering the Design of it, nor treated with such Contempt since, as they have been by this Writer now, and before by him or some of his Friends. Or had an Accommodation of the present Methods of proceeding, without settling the Right either way, been as much their Desire at the opening of this Convocation, as they pretended it was toward the end of the last; this had been a proper Occasion for them to have shewn it upon. For the *Proposals* of doing Business in *Committees*, instead of *intermediate Sessions*, and ordering the Prorogations so as not to interrupt Business upon the Synodical Days, might certainly have been accepted as a Scheme for present Practice, without Prejudice to the Right of either House.

Separate Application to the Queen, no sign of their Desires of Peace,

But the *Hopes* which this favourable Alteration of Circumstances gave them, were, it seems, not of any such Compromise for avoiding of present Disputes, but of a Determination to be made in their Favour; and therefore nothing would satisfy them, but laying this Controversie before the Queen by a *separate Application*, when they found the Archbishop and Bishops did not think it proper to give her Majesty that Trouble.

I will not ask this Writer by *what springs without doors* this Motion was directed within, because he expresses such an Abhorrence in the second Page of his Preface, of being under *these kind of Influences*: But if he reflects upon all the Circumstances with which this Application was pursued, till it was actually presented, I cannot help thinking but that he will in his own Mind agree with me (if I may use his own Words) that *Victory was the thing aimed at, and not Accommodation*.

However her Majesty in her Royal Wisdom, did not think fit to do what these Petitioners desired of her, but left both Houses to be govern'd by the Rules that were already before them, in hopes of their finding among themselves the right way of putting an end to these unhappy Disputes.

Let

Let us then see what other means the Lower House pretends to have used for the attaining this End. This Writer tells us in his Preface, *That there was but one way more of silencing these Disputes possible to be practised, and that was by turning the Thoughts of the Synod upon publick Business; an Expedient which he says, they frequently triell,* as it must be confess'd that they did.

But before we consider the particular Instances in which they made this Experiment, I must observe here what has been said to them before, and abundantly proved, particularly by the Right Reverend the Bishop of *Lincoln*, in his *State of the Church*, That neither by the Tenor of the Writ of Summons, nor by the Archbishop's Summons upon it, are the Clergy to enter upon any proper Synodical Business, till it is duly referred to them, nor have they attempted it in former Convocations; that by the 25th of *Henry VIII.* they are restrained from entring upon such Business, till they are thereto particularly empower'd by a Royal License; that previous to such License all they can pretend to, is to represent to the Bishops, the Occasions they apprehend there may be for desiring such a Power: tho' this is more than appears to have been done before these Disputes. Without this License they may apply to the Upper House, for the Redress of such Grievances as they think themselves under, and may be relieved by the Archbishop and Bishops in their ordinary Capacities. But what is of a more general Nature, and requires an Act of the whole Synod to redress in a Convocational way, cannot be regularly entred upon, but under the Restrictions above-mention'd: And therefore, they who press Synodical Business upon the Archbishop and Bishops without regard to these Limitations, are so far from taking a proper way to silence Disputes, that they take the most ready Course to raise new ones, and involve the Synod in still greater Difficulties.

*Entring upon
Business with-
out Power, no
method of
Peace.*

Method of doing Business to be first settled.

But had the way been clear in that Respect for the entering upon Synodical Business, as it was not; yet it had been in vain to attempt it, before the Members were agreed upon the Method of doing such Business, nor would it have ended any present Dispute. The Disputes, without meeting at all, or meeting only to be dismissed of course, might have rested till we had been disposed to consider them fairly. But such a constant and solemn Meeting as the doing of Business supposes, could not but bring on the Controversy as often as the House came together, till the Forms were adjusted; as in Fact also it did, except when for avoiding the Appearance of perpetual Contention, the Members that were out-voted, forbore to complain of, or expressly oppose what they always believed an irregular Practice.

For this reason, agreeing in a regular way of proceeding might have made it easier to go on upon Business, but Business could never have settled the way of proceeding. And having promised thus much, I go on to consider the particular things which they importunately desir'd to put the Archbishop and Bishops and their Brethren upon.

Appointing Committees for Business in the Lower House only, no method of Peace.

This Writer makes a great flourish with the several Committees appointed in the first Convocation of 1700. But surely the appointing the three first of these at least, for Synodical Business of great and general Consequence, without either Royal License, or the Advice of the Bishops first had; was a very preposterous way of promoting Peace; when it was it self contrary to that Method of appointing such Committees, as does ordinarily, if not always, appear on the Registers, and carried with it a manifest Neglect of their Superiors with whom they had the Dispute. They may make it, if they please, a mark of their Zeal to be doing, but not of their Desire of putting things into a quiet Condition.

However

However, let us consider what these Committees ^{Concerning} produced: And we are told by this Writer, that ^{the censuring} ~~one of~~ ^{of Books.} them quickly produced a Complaint against Mr. Toland's *Per-nicious Book*. I doubt a little too quickly, for the Ex-tracts made out of it did not appear to the Bishops to be duly considered; who looking more carefully into it, laid their Fingers upon two Propositions, unobserved by the Lower House, that contained the Foundation of all the rest of the Errors dispersed in that Book; and advised with Counsel what could legally be done by them, in the publick censuring of it. And when they found they could not proceed in that way, as the *Right Reverend the Bishop of London*, who presided in 1689, had, upon a like Occasion, found also before them, though a Royal License for other Business was granted to that Convocation; they recommended it to the Bishop of the *Diocese*, in which the Author resided, to call him to an Account for that Book, and as he should see Cause to proceed against him, according to the *Ecclesiastical Laws*. A full Account is given of this in the History of Convocation, &c. and in the Observations of the Upper House, publish'd in the *Complainer* further reprov'd, as this Writer Page 14. cannot but know: And yet he is not ashamed to tell his Reader, that this *Application was not in the least countenanc'd, or regarded, but stifled in the Birth*; when all was done upon it by the Upper House that they were impower'd to do. I might add, that this Book was Ill Books answered by the Bishop's Friends. soon after, at the Recommendation of the Archbishop, censured the best way, by the Reverend Dr. *Willis Dean of Lincoln*, so that the Author publicly retracted those Propositions, which the Archbishop and Bishops had observed as the Ground of his Errors: And of this Retraction, Mention also is made in the Observations referred to above. Occas. Paper, Num. 3.

I am not aware that so much has been done toward the stopping the Growth of such Errors by any of those Persons, that treat their Superiours as cold in these Matters,

Matters, and pretend to great Concern themselves for the Truth of the Christian Religion.

With as little Reason does this Writer renew the Complaint, which his Friends before made against the Archbishops and Bishops, as neglecting to take any Notice of Dr. Coward's Book against the Immortality of the Soul, which they could no more proceed against in a Convocational way, than against the Book before-mentioned. The way which the Law directed was taken by the then Bishop of *Norwich*, in whose Diocese the Author resided, till that Prosecution drove him away; and when he escaped by that Means, Enquiry was made after him, and Notice given to the Bishop of *London*, into whose Diocese he quickly removed; as may be seen more at large, in the Observations above-mentioned.

Page 14.

Another Treatise against the *Natural Immortality of the Soul* from a greater Author, and more likely to spread its dangerous Doctrine, came out while this Convocation was sitting, and forward in passing their Judgments on Books; and yet had the good Luck or Favour to be over-looked; while the Reverend Mr. *Clark*, at the Encouragement of the Bishop who had lately proceeded against Dr. *Coward*, writes a substantial Answer to it.

And, if these *Complainers* would seriously set themselves to confute the Errors, of which they express such Abhorrence, in a Calm and Rational way, they would be much better employed, than in pushing their Superiours upon condemning them in such a manner as the Law disallows, and would more effectually stop the Growth of such Pernicious Opinions.

Concerning
the Liberty of
the Press.

Another Method which this Writer says they proposed for this End, and which he again reproaches the Archbishop and Bishops for not supporting them in, was, restraining the Liberty of the Press; while he cannot but know, what has also been long since publish'd from

from the Upper House Books in the *Complainer further* Page 6.
Reproved, that the President twice attempted to procure
 the Consent of the two Houses of Parliament to a Bill
 for that Purpose, tho' without the Success he propos'd.

These, and many other Heads of Business, he says,
they suggested often, and much insisted on: They drew up Pref. p. 6.
 also a large *Representation of their Grievances*, Feb. 1701; Representa-
 and they might have told us, that it was published to tion of Grie-
 the World just before the Convocation sat the next Win- vances.
 ter, and before they could know what had been done
 throughout the Province, toward the Redress of them.
 I hope, both they that drew it up, and they that pub-
 lished it, sincerely intended the *Reformation of the Church*;
 tho' it could not be much, either for the Honour or the
 Advantage of its Constitution, to put such an Account
 of its State into the Hands of its Enemies, and re-
 present the Governours of it, with many of their own
 Members, as the backwardest of all Men to have it
 amended.

This was not the Sense of the Majority of the Lower The Sense of
 House in 1689, who, according to the Observations of the Majority
 the Upper House, with a Royal License in their Hands, in 1689.
thought they could not better serve the Church, than by de-
clining the Business that was proposed to them. Neither did
 this seem to have been the Sense of Dr. A. when he
 wrote his Preface to the *Rights, &c.* for there he is an- Page 16.
 gry with Dr. Wake for saying no more to the Advantage
 of the Church of England, than that it had a peculiar Ve-
neration for the Discipline and Doctrine of the Primitive
Church, beyond most Churches in the World, and makes
 this a shrew'd Intimation, that if the Dr. should be ad-
 vanced, as to the great Honour of the Church he has
 since been, he would, to his *Complaints against Church-men,*
add others concerning the Church it self; and say, that even
her Canons and Constitutions want reforming.

How the State of it comes to be altered so much since
 that time, or how Men's Opinions about it come to be
 chan-

changed, I shall not enquire. But whatever was the Design of making and publishing this Representation, it could not certainly be *Peace*, as this Writer pretends: Had that been the Design, it would not have been printed just at the Time, and in the Manner it was, as is rightly observed in the Preface of the *Complainer Reprou'd*.

This Representation was publish'd when there had been a pretty long Silence; and some Papers that were ready on the Upper House side, had been kept back on no other Inducement, but to let the Controversie rest, that seemed to have been almost asleep.

At this Juncture it came out with a Preface full of indecent Reflections, and without any Notice of what had passed in the Upper House, with Relation to it; tho' they own themselves, in one of their Papers that following Winter, *that it had a very favourable Reception and Answer from his Grace.*

*Collection, &c.
Numb. 21.
Paper 2.*

I hope the Reader will be at the Pains of perusing that Answer which is printed in the *Complainer Reprou'd*, and is rather too long to be reprinted here; tho' it might be so, with greater Regard to Justice and Peace, than this Author has in his Paper printed the third time their *Complaint of Dec. 1. 1704*, without any Notice taken of the Observations made upon it in the *Complainer further Reprou'd*; whereas no Reply has ever been made to that Answer, which his Grace gave to their Representation with great Temper and Prudence, besides this reprinted Complaint; which how just a Reply it was, we shall see by and by.

A short Account of the Archbishop's Answer to the Representation.

The Archbishop told the Lower House, *Apr. 3. 1704*, That Copies of their Representation were ordered to be made out for all the Bishops, who he did not doubt would make the proper Use of them; and when he had taken Notice in the most gentle manner, of the Faults that occurred to him in the Form of that Representation, he observes, That some of the things represented came not properly under the
Eccle-

Ecclesiastical Authority, as that concerning Tenths, of which yet he hoped for Redress in a proper way. That those Matters which were strictly of Ecclesiastical Cognizance, and fell under the Canons already made, as most of them did, tho' very fit to be redress'd, were no Occasion for asking a Royal Licence to give them new Powers, but were to be remedied by the Canons already made, which he hoped would from time to time be observed.

That the late King, of Glorious Memory, had by his Injunctions enforced the most considerable of them, and that he himself had pressed the Observation of those Injunctions in his own Circular Letter, and that the Articles of Enquiry in Episcopal Visitations, since printed, shew that they were not forgotten. That his Brethren had suggested other Particulars not mentioned in their Representation, which wanted Amendment, such as Omission of Prayer before Sermon for the Queen and Royal Family; Publick Opposition between Preachers; Simony, and Collusive Contracts to avoid the Law against it; Illegal Absence of Pastors from their Flocks, with many others. That some of these Evils had been endeavour'd to be cured by them at great Expence of Time, and Pains, and Money, and that in some of them they had found Success: That upon the whole there had never been more frequent and careful Visitations of Bishops in Person, more strict Examinations for Orders, more solemn and orderly Confirmations, than since our last publick Deliverance from the open Attempts of Popery.

That, notwithstanding, he should be glad to see the State of the Church more perfect, and that he should willingly communicate his Own and his Brethrens further Thoughts, when they met again in greater Numbers of both Houses, than at that time attended.

This is a short but faithful Account of what the Archbishop said; and I dare leave it to any Lover of Truth and Peace to determin, whether it was an Argument of a meek and quiet Spirit, after the Representation had been so fairly considered, and recommended to the rest

of the Bishops, to print it just at the next sitting of the Convocation, with so reflecting a Preface before it.

Page 2. c. 1.

The Publisher of it tells us, that the Jealousies which have been entertained of some Prelates, and other Eminent Dignitaries of the Church, as if they were not true Friends to Convocations, will be best cured by shewing a more than ordinary Vigour and Activity in promoting the proper Work of such Assemblies; and that it will be just for such of the Lower House, who may be under such Prejudices, to change their Sentiments so soon, as such Bishops and such Clergy shall shew themselves as forward to do Business in Convocation, as they have hitherto appeared backward.

Page 3. c. 2.

But he gives no Hopes of maintaining the Honour of the Bishops and Clergy acting in due Obedience to them, without falling in heartily with such Measures as he there recommends. On the contrary he says, In such a happy Juncture, under such a Queen, if nothing be done by the governing Clergy for the retrieving the Honour, and shewing the Usefulness of Convocations, this ancient part of our Constitution will soon moulder away, and the Ruin of it will be wholly owing to the Supineness of those, who being intrusted with the care of preserving it safe and entire, for the Honour of God, and the Good of his Church, will never be able to excuse themselves to the World, or their own Consciences, for such an unpardonable Breach of so Sacred a Trust.

The Representation coming out with such a Preface as this, could hardly have any other Design, than (as the Complainer Reproved has observed) reminding their Members of their Cause, and exasperating their Spirits against the next Meeting; an Effect, which we find it accordingly had.

The Paper of
Complaint,
Dec. 1. 1704.

For as this Writer puts us in Mind, at another time viz. Dec. 1. 1704, which was pretty early in this Winters Meeting, They offered a Paper, which He (as I hinted before) has reprinted entire; that may indeed be of Use, to satisfy the Reader what Temper and Spirit the Clergy were

were of, and what Views governed their Proceedings: but I think, not to shew that they were of such a peaceable Temper and Spirit, or followed such publick Views, as he seems to expect his Reader should fully believe; if there is any means of knowing what Expressions are Modest and Decent, from those that are Rude and Reflecting.

The Blame, that so little has been done for the publick Good of the Church, and that such Disputes have been raised and continued in Convocation to the Hindrance of it, is wholly laid on the Archbishop and Bishops, and such Members of their own House as oppos'd their Pretences. They repeat the Complaint about Books, which had been so fully answered before, and say, they found no Success from these their reiterated Addresses, and tell their Lordships, *they were fully satisfied they might have done more than they did.* They say, *they shall very much rejoyce to be informed by their Lordships that such Use had been made, as his Grace trusted would be, of their Representation, and shall be thankful to their Lordships for what they shall learn has been done by them, for the Redress of those Abuses.* I don't know how smooth to some People this Language may seem; but I think, in the plain English of it, they call their Superiors to an account, in a way unknown to all former Convocations of this Church, and much more so to the Synods of other Episcopal Churches.

The Archbishop might, with as much more Justice as Authority, have enquired what had been done in that time by the Inferior Clergy, in those parts of the Representation in which they were concerned, and particularly in the things intimated by his Grace at the last rising of the Convocation, such as *Prayer before their Sermons, and Residence upon their Cures.* But no one that had Authority to enquire, would have insisted upon an Account to be given, so soon after things of

that Nature and Extent had been delivered in Charge; much less should they have expected it, who had no Jurisdiction over their Bishops.

*The Conduct
of the Lower
House in
1586, as to
these Matters.
Dr. A. Rights,
&c. p. 656,
2d Edit.*

The Clergy of the Lower House in 1586, seem to have governed themselves by other Measures than these. They brought up indeed several Complaints, according to the Extracts Dr. A. gives us out of his Extracts of the Upper House Books; but nothing of this appears so much as in the Books of the Lower House, beyond an Admonition from the Prolocutor, after he had been with the Archbishop on the 2d Session, to prepare such Schedules, if they had any, against the next Session. And in the Upper House, Nov. 18. according to the Extracts, Intimation is given them to Present, *if any Bishop had ordained or instituted any unworthy Person, &c.* But all that we find in the entire Journals of the Lower House on that Day, is, that the Prolocutor and House were sent for up, and received an Admonition from the Archbishop to observe the Canons; and when they returned, the Prolocutor exhorts them to remember the Admonition. And when from the Extracts of the Upper House, two Schedules are said to be brought up by the Lower House, Dec. 2. all that we find in the Lower House Books, is, *that the Prolocutor went up with three more, and being returned, told them, that the Archbishop and Bishops were in Consultation, de Reformatione fienda quoad Schedulas eidem Reverendissimo ac Domino Prolocutori exhibitas, & quod conventum est inter dictum Reverendissimum & Prælatos de exercitiis fiendis per Ministros infra Provinc. Cantuar. and that the said Reverend Fathers will signifie the Order of these Exercises to all that are concern'd.* This was at the Prorogation of the Convocation, from Dec. 2. to Feb. 17.

Upon the 10 of March following, we are told from the Extracts that the Prolocutor pray'd the Articles agreed on by the Bishops, for increase of Learning in Inferiour Ministers, might be read, and that on the 15th the Lower House did beseech the Bishops

to be careful about Ordinations &c. but this is not enter'd in the Acts of the Lower House: we find nothing there about such matters till the last Session of this Convocation, when they give an Account of the Admonition which the Archbishop gave to the Deans and Archdeacons, and such as had Jurisdiction, to see Disorders reformed, and to call in the Help of the Bishops, if they could not do it alone, or the Archbishop himself if that appeared necessary, or even of the Queen, if it could not otherwise be done.

The Clergy of that time departed with this Admonition, and left no new marks of their Dissatisfaction behind them: but the Clergy of this do first complain in a very different manner, and make solemn Acts of it in their own House, and when they have received a more condescending Answer than appears to have been given upon any like Occasion before, they publish this Representation to the World with those Reflections mentioned above. And yet they detest in this Paper any sinister Intention of bringing an *Odium upon their Lordships* by the Representation they made, and call it a false and uncharitable Surmise, to suppose that they had any such thought. I shall therefore leave it to God and themselves, not knowing how to deal with Men, that protest in so solemn a manner against that which in common Construction they do; and go on to the next Head of their Paper, wherein they think themselves obliged to repeat a Motion formerly made to their Lordships about a Bill for the more easy and speedy Recovery of Church Rates.

And this Motion is reprinted here, as if no notice had been taken of it, tho' in the Observations of the Upper House, referred to before, they were told that they knew very well that the President had communicated a Draught of further reprobation that Bill, as well as a Bill about the Press, to several of their House, in hopes of some Improvements from their Observations, but both were returned without any Intimation that they had been at all considered.

The different Conduct of the Members of these late Convocations, from those in 1586.

Bill about Church Rates. Complainer ved. p. 16.

There

*The difficulty
in admini-
string the Sa-
crament.*

There is the like Fairness in reprinting in this Paper, in respect of the last Paragraph of it; wherein they pray their Lordships to use their Interest for the freeing them from the Difficulties they were under about administering the Sacrament to all Persons indifferently, and to direct them in the mean time how they should behave themselves under them: when they were refer'd, in the Observations above-mentioned, to the Rubrick before the Communion Service, which was established by Act of Parliament, and was the surest and best Rule the Bishops could give.

And that it may not be said, that the Observations made in the Upper House were no Answer to the Applications of the Lower, not being sent thither to them; I must observe, That when they carried up another Paper the 14th of February following, complaining that they had receiv'd no Reply to that of December 1. they were told by the Archbishop March 15. that these Observations upon it were drawn up and approved, and passed in Form, and enter'd among the Publick Acts of their House, and that their Deputy-Register had special and repeated Directions to shew them freely to any Person who should desire to peruse them, as they were well assured that some of the Complainers very well knew. And yet this Writer is not ashamed to say, that upon some of their Requests, which, notwithstanding their former Concessions, he here says were All received with a Coldness and Neglect. that was very amazing, The Bishops contented themselves to make Observations in writing, without imparting them to their Clergy, and without entering them in their Books, where Recourse might be had to them. This I think is very amazing.

The Reason why the Archbishop and Bishops gave that Paper no other Answer, was, as the President told them, the Unprofitfulness of it; and the World must be left to judge whether it treated the Archbishop and Bishops with that Respect, which the Drawers of it profess to have for their Station and Order.

With

With the same Reverence for Truth and Regard to the Archbishop and Bishops no doubt it is, that this Writer tells us in the next Paragraph, *that when Business of high Consequence to the Church, and such as was likely to do honour to the Promoters of it, was started by the Clergy, Attempts of the same kind without doors were set forward which might supersede theirs.* Thus when the Committee was appointed to consider what might be done towards propagating the Christian Religion, as professed in the Church of England, in our Foreign Plantations — and had made some Progress in it, a Charter was presently procured to place that Matter in other Hands. A Charter was indeed procured by a proper Application of the Archbishops and Bishops, after the Appointment of the Committee he mentions ; but he could be hardly ignorant that this Matter had been in Agitation, and was in great forwardness a good while before ; and therefore ought not to have treated it here in such a manner, as if it had been first started in Convocation, and only set forwards without doors to supersede their Endeavours. Nor ought the Charter to be treated as procured on purpose to put the Matter into other Hands : For into what other Hands would he have it put ? both the Archbishops, the Bishop of London and other Lords Spiritual and Temporal, with several Members of the Lower House, were in the first Charter, and many others of both Houses soon after chosen into that Corporation. Could the Convocation have managed this Business themselves ? or could they have put it into other Hands ? or is it just matter of Complaint that the Business was put into the best Method it could be by proper means, before the Lower House came to any Resolution about it ?

There is Reason to think that some such Objection as this against the Corporation which K. William established, and Her present Majesty has graciously encouraged, hinder'd Dr. Atterbury from adding a Note at least to his second part of *the Miraculous Propagation of the Gospel*, first published P. 147. the

The Charter for the propagating the Gospel, &c.

the last year, in abatement of that Reproach which he leaves his own Nation under, as neglecting this Work; while he speaks favourably of those Good Men (*tho' of another Communion*) whose honest Zeal has carried them farther. I know not whether he can tell us the Names of those of that other Communion, by which we must suppose the *Papish* is meant, who, as he there speaks, may be reasonably supposed to be led into the Design, by sincere Motives of advancing the Glory of God, and the Salvation of Souls, without aiming at By-ends, or any temporal Advantages. But in the Accounts they have given us of those Missions, we do not find that the Conversions boasted of have wrought any great Changes, either in the Souls of Men, or in the Idolatry of their Worship.

*Historie de
Chine Liv. 2.
c. 1. 6. 7. An.
1606.*

The History of China, which has regard to the earliest Missions, represents that Country as well-disposed to embrace that which the Priests of the Church of Rome offered to them for the Christian Religion. They tell us, they found there an Image, in the greatest Veneration, with three Heads upon one Body, looking upon one another, which they discover'd to have been the Picture of the Trinity, tho the Tradition was in a manner lost among the People: as also another Image of a beautiful Woman, with a Child in her Arms, set over their Altars, which by the same Sagacity they discovered to have been antiently designed for the Virgin Mary: they found likewise the Belief of Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, and Prayers for the Dead, and in short such a Symbolizing in many things with the Church of Rome, that the Missionaries seem'd to have had little left them to do, but to New-christen the Images as well as the People. A Practice with which they have, I doubt, with too much justice been charged.

Part 1. c. 33.

As to the West Indies, Hennepin tells us, That would he follow the Example of other Missionaries, he could have boasted of many Conversions; for he might easily have baptized all those Nations, meaning the Illinois, and then say, as he was afraid they did without any ground, that he had converted them.

In

In another place he says, *they liked the outward Ceremonies of their Church but no more*; and in another, *that the Salvages reproached them once in the Presence of Monsieur Le Comte de Frontenac, that while the Beavers and Furrs lasted, he that prayed was with them, &c. but when these failed, those Missioners thought they could do no farther Service among them.* Part 2. c. 14.
Cap. 30.

And whoever looks into the *Catechism and Ritual*, published by the *Bishop of Quebeck* for the Missioners and Priests of that Diocese, soon after this Corporation began; particularly as to the Invocation of Saints, and Adoration of Images, and the Forms of Blessing any new Cross or Image for such Adoration, will think the Words in which our Saviour reproved the Pharisees, *as compassing Sea and Land to gain a Profelyte*, more applicable to such Missioners, than those soft Expressions, which this Author, who can use hard ones upon other Occasions, bestows upon them. Cat. p. 150,
161.
Rit. p. 411,
412, 413.

As this is too much the State of their Missions, on which I will not say but some may have honestly gone; so we had on the other side, so much a better Account of our own Propagation of the Gospel, that it had been proper for him in this place, to have done Justice to his Country and to this Corporation, by the Mention of it. Account of
the Society,
1706.

The Writer, with whom I am at present concerned, does indeed in this Paper, where he complains of the Matter as taken out of the Hands of the Clergy, express his Hopes, that it will produce excellent Fruits in the Hands where it is; but then he says, that *whatever they are, they must be acknowledged to have sprung from the Overtures to that purpose first made by the Lower House of Convocation*: whereas, if either took the Hint from the other, it must be the Convocation that took it from those, who were far advanced in it by the Building of the College and other Preparations, long before any Convocation sat.

These I think are all the Steps insisted on, in the Preface to the *Faithful Account*, as taken by the Lower House for the sake of *Order and Peace*; and I believe they will appear to every indifferent Reader to have been very extraordinary Methods of pursuing so excellent an End.

Faithful Account examined.

Page 1.

Let us see whether the *Faithful Account* it self will afford us any better than these: If we will take the Writer's own Word, he assures us at the very beginning, that *never did any Body of Men meet together more heartily disposed to pursue the Methods of Peace, than the Clergy called to Convocation, Oct. 25. 1705.* It is true, as he says, *That after chusing the Prolocutor, they forbore placing him in the Chair, waving their Claim for Peace sake, without receding from it.* And had they done so in all other Cases, it had looked like a Desire of having Things settled in a quiet and orderly Manner. But such a single Instance of *Forbearance to exert that which he here calls their own Right*, notwithstanding all that has been written against it, attended with such a Conduct as immediately followed, will not pass with considering Men, for any great Proof of an Inclination to Peace.

For that which he tells us in the next Paragraph of the *Prolocutor's and his Presenter's Speeches breathing nothing but an earnest Desire of Peace*, cannot be allow'd him, as to the Presenter at least; who spoke of Peace indeed as this Writer speaks of it, expressing at the same time great Indignation against, and making severe Reflections on those whom he treated and sufficiently described, as defeating the Ends of a Synod; and for this I appeal to the Memories of all that were present and heard him.

Page 1.

The next Proof he offers of their peaceable Temper, was, *their not attempting in three Months time to meet on a Day different from that appointed by the Bishops, though they were provoked to it by an Adjournment of the Upper House, from Dec. 15, to Feb. 1, and by a Protestation of some of their own Members received and encouraged by their Lordships.* What Reason they had to be provoked by this Protestation,

station, shall be considered in its Place; but surely the *Adjournment*, as they are pleased to call it, of the Upper House, from Dec. 15, to Feb. 1, was no such great Provocation, when at this very time the Absence of *many Members, who were gone into the Country upon the account of* Page 9. *the approaching Festival*, is given by this Writer, from the Acts of the House, as a Reason for hindering the Dean of *Peterborough* from reading the Paper he offered to the House, Dec. 15.

Nor ought it to have been made, as it is by this Writer, an Aggravation of this long Prorogation, that by that means they were prevented from meeting as an House, and hearing *Divine Service and Sermon* on Jan. 30; when the Archbishop, at the making of that Prorogation, gave this and the other State-Fast, which was appointed within a few Days of it, as a Reason why the Clergy could not conveniently attend till these two Duties were over. And certainly there was more Reason to apprehend Scandal arising from those Duties not being attended in their several Places, by the several Persons immediately concerned, than from not having a Sermon in *Hen. VII's Chapel*, which they could not have as an House, unless the Convocation had been prorogu'd to that Day; a thing that never was done, and which, according to their own late Practice, they might have had in the way of a voluntary Meeting, notwithstanding this Prorogation.

For it was in this way of a voluntary Meeting, that any Sermons had been preached there upon such Occasions, in these late Convocations; a Practice for which they have no other Precedent, than that single Instance in 1640, which should not, one would think, have such Authority with them, when it was not enough to lead the Lower House of Convocation in 1661 into any such Practices, not even for the Sake of the 30th of Jan. to which we are sure they had a particular Regard; as the Office for that Day was settled in that Convocation,

with the other two Offices, for *Nov. 5*, and *May 29*, upon *April 26*, 1662.

But upon neither of these Days do we find any Sermons before the Lower House: The next Return of all of them, indeed, fell within the Compass of a Prorogation upon Writ, from *May 20*, to *Feb. 19*; but in the *May* of the following Year, 1663, the Convocation is prorogued without any Writ, from the 23d to the 30th of that Month; and in 1664, the Convocation is sitting again, and continued by the ordinary Prorogation, from *Jan. 27*, to *Feb. 3*. On both, or at least one of these Days, the *Zeal of that House* would have shewn it self, as it has done of late, had they thought that a proper Expression of it.

But I shall not spend more time in taking off the Greatness of this Provocation, because this Writer tells us, that notwithstanding this they kept, as yet, to the same Day with the Bishops; and I will add, that the first Prorogation in the Lower House, was made or intimated by the Prolocutor, without asking *the Consent of the House*, tho' it now stands enter'd with the Consent; but in all the Prorogations after, the Question was put, and the Prorogation made, and entered, not at all from the *Schedule*, but meerly with the Consent of the House; which kept up the Claim of their Right to *Intermediate Sessions*, as much as if they had actually held them.

However, another Prorogation for a Month put them out of all Patience, and broke all their peaceable Measures, and made them to return to *Intermediate Sessions*: from that time this Writer allows they gave over all Thoughts of Accommodation, and asks in the Words of *David*, *Was there not a Cause?* They must indeed be mightily in earnest for Peace, who could break it upon so slight an Occasion as a Month's Prorogation, when no Business was referr'd to the Convocation, nor any Powers given to enter on any, nor the Methods of proceeding agreed on.

But

But tho' they gave over all Thoughts of Accommodation, yet they hoped, as this Writer informs us, that the Disputes might have been confined within their own Walls; and he is very angry with *an indiscreet Pen* for *imparting to the World, while the Body was sitting, an Account of some of their Proceedings.* One would think by this Complaint, that neither this Writer nor any of his Friends imparted any of their Disputes to People without doors, and that the World was quite unacquainted with what pass'd this Winter, till this Account of the Proceedings came out: Whereas in truth, the particular Differences that happened this Year, were in every Bodies Mouth, and I believe neither He nor his Friends will pretend to have been silent about them. And therefore it was no Indiscretion to put a true Account of these Matters into the Hands of those, who would have equally talk'd of them however, though not so exactly.

P. 2. About
keeping Dis-
putes within
Doors.

If this Account was not a just one, it was the effect of something worse than *an indiscreet Pen*; but if it was, as I believe it will appear to have been, I cannot see the Indiscretion of publishing it, as Matters then stood, or the reason they have to find fault; who on Feb. 4. appointed a Committee to draw up a Representation to the Clergy of the Province, setting forth what Methods have been taken by this House for doing Business, and how they have been defeated, and their Apprehensions of the Consequences that may attend their Claim of such a sole Power, as hath of late been pretended to and practised.

The Former
Account on
the other side.

But before I say any thing about the Truth of this Account, I must take notice of an Entry, which their Writer transcribes from the Acts of their House, Mar. 1. importing, that when it was moved, that any Member that had Possession of the Account, would be so just to the House, as to produce it——no Member would, tho' one of them acknowledged he had one, and had sent three into the Country. This is indeed an Entry of great Moment in this Affair,

Page 2.

fair, and very worthy to be published in the Paper before us. I can see no reason any Member had to disown his having one, or any Obligation he had to produce one, if he could have done it at the time, as he could not. He told the House, that the Book which some Members on that side owned they had seen, could not be a Secret, as the Book was not intended to be; That however, they had no reason to expect it should be produced, in the manner they asked it, by any of that side whom they charged with the Disingenuity of it: That the Members concerned in it, had the same Power over an Account drawn up in their own Vindication, that the Members of the other side had over that Account which they had ordered to be drawn in their Defence, and had not yet communicated to the opposite side; That Both were at liberty to produce their Accounts, as they saw occasion, and were answerable to one another only for the *Sincerity* and *Decency* of them.

As this was said at that time, so if the House had thought any part of such a Transaction as this, worthy to be put into the Acts of the House, I am sure they ought in Justice to have added the Reasons upon which that Member declined doing what they desired. But I confess I am somewhat at a Loss, to think how such an Entry as this should come to be made in the *Acts of their House*, especially on that particular Day. For while this Matter was under Debate, the House was sent for up to the Archbishop and Bishops, and the whole Convocation was there prorogued, in Obedience to a Letter from Her Majesty sent for that purpose: And I am very sure there was no Direction given in the House for any such Entry, before they went up.

It is true, the Prolocutor returned to the House with the Members on that side, after the Convocation was prorogued in the manner related; so that he best knows, whether any Question was put to the House about making

making such an Entry as this; to say nothing of the great Odness of entering a part of a Debate among the Acts of the House, when no proper Act of the House appears to be in it, nor is said in the Act-Book to be ordered. But as wrong and as odd it is, I know no Body concerned to have it removed, as it can hurt none but those that put it there in so irregular a manner.

However, it seems this sturdy Pamphlet was got at last *with great Difficulty, and laid before the House, Mar. 7.* Page 3. and I suppose was their chief Business of meeting on that intermediate Session, after they were prorogued as above. But the Members who were concerned to justify it, not being there, as indeed they could not regularly be, *it was respited*, as this Writer informs us, to *Mar. 13.* another intermediate Session, when the Members expected could as little be there; and then no body appearing in Defence of it, the poor Book was condemned without Mercy, as *disingenuous, partial, false and scandalous*; but not one Instance of that Disingenuity, Partiality, Falshood and Scandal produced then, nor at any time since, nor, as far as I see, to be expected hereafter. For this Writer tells us, *after a Vote pass'd with so much Solemnity, &c. it would be altogether needless to examine that Paper.* But I cannot tell whether the World will be contented with this, and allow the Lower House, so assembled, to be such competent Judges in a Case that so nearly related to themselves, as to submit to their Sentence, which appears without any Evidence to support it; only because it was pronounc'd in a Place that ought to have had greater Influence on the Minds of those that met in it, than we have hitherto found.

I shall not enter much into the Personal Reflections which this Writer makes on the Person he supposes to have been the Author of the fore-mentioned Account, and which I think a Man that makes such Professions of regard to Truth and Peace should have wholly forborn: And the rather because it has put People upon guessing
at

at this Writer also, and saying that the Person suppos'd has the least reason of all Men to reproach others with *Fabulous History*, had there been any occasion given him here, where no Instance of Falshood being produced, there is reason to think it is the Truth of this Historian that has drawn so much Displeasure upon him. But it has been the Practice of this Writer and his Friends, from the very beginning, to call the Accounts of those that opposed them, false and scandalous, without ever shewing any particular wherein they were so; as they were told in the Preface to the Account of the Convocation in 1702.

The Design of
the Faithful
Account.
Page 3.

Waving therefore these uncomfortable Remarks, let us go on to consider what this Writer calls his *Faithful Account*: He says he does not propose a Discovery of the *Falsifications* of the former Account, but of the Truth it self, by printing such Original Papers and Acts of the Lower House as may do justice to the Cause, vindicate the Reputation, and clear the good Intention of the Body, and that chiefly in their difference with the Bishops about the Form of an Address, and general Assertion of their Rights, and their Attempts to proceed upon Business.

The Difference
about the
Address.

P. 32, 33.

As to their Difference with the Bishops about the Form of an Address, this Writer assures us that the Omission of the *Protestant Succession* among the Securities of the Church, and charging all Insinuations of its Danger with *Prejudice, Interest, and Ambition*, were the **chief Exceptions which the Clergy had to that Address**: he does not say they were the Chief which they made, we find others in the former Account, which we are to look on as truly delivered, till the Members who complain of being misrepresented, give a more credible Relation of what they then said. But if these were sincerely the chief Exceptions they had, it had been very easy for them to have got them removed. Could it be better to break with the Bishops in so unprecedented a manner, than to offer two Amendments that might take off

of these Exceptions, when they were required to shew in Writing what they disliked. I am persuaded this Writer is fully assured that an Insertion of the *Protestant Succession* would have been readily received by the Archbishop and Bishops, whose Sense had been sufficiently declared in the House of Lords before; and the House had no occasion to doubt, but that if they would have freely and plainly declared their Sense of the *Safety of the Church*, with respect to the publick *Clamour* then rais'd and kept up of its being *in Danger*, without assigning the Causes of such a Suggestion, the Archbishop and Bishops would have easily comply'd; as hard as it was to say, from what other Springs such a *Clamour* could rise than those they mentioned,

However it could not have done any hurt to have tried, but might have given them a real Advantage over the Bishops, had their Lordships refused to accept their plain Declaration, for want of such an Assertion to go along with it. But had this been truly the Case, they would have spoken more plainly of the *Safety of the Church* in the Form they drew up, in which they did mention the *Protestant Succession*: whereas whoever peruses that Form will find no such thing, nor any other Assurance expressed, but what singly terminated in her Majesties Person, and consequently was in Effect exclusive of her Administration, the very thing to be cleared at this time for the Quiet of the Nation, as what was then publickly aspersed to the Disturbance of it.

The Lower House did indeed concur in such a Declaration as this the very next Winter; but whether it was any Alteration in the State of Affairs, or in their Opinion about them, or any other Spring from without, that occasioned this Change, this Writer 'tis probable could have given us the truest Account, had he been pleased to inform us. For one of the Members of that side freely declared he saw no reason to alter his former Opinion, and therefore could no more agree to declare

*The Address
of the next
Year.*

the Church was in Safety this year, than he could do it the Winter before. At that time, as has been observed, they rejected the Address that declared it, and drew up another of their own, that made no such Acknowledgment. And yet this is the Address they insisted to have received by the Archbishop and Bishops, after they had not only refused to agree to the Address which their Lordships sent down; but even to shew any Reason why they would not, or offer any Amendment that might produce a Concurrence. This Writer has reprinted the Form, in which they insisted upon This; which I am contented should be left to the World to judge of it, whether it be agreeable to the Character of Presbyters, or no.

Page 8.

Against this manner of Proceeding, which was expressed in the Message the Prolocutor carried up to introduce their Address, a great deal has been said in the former Account, which this Writer has done no more to take off, than he has to shake the History of it. And, upon the Paper I last mentioned, which they carried up afterwards, Dec. 1, the President and his Suffragans made *Observations*, and *entred them in the Acts of their House*. These *Observations* this Writer owns are published in the former Account, to which he refers the Reader that has a mind to peruse them, but he is above taking any notice of them himself: which in justice he ought to have done, as little Authority as he tells us he has to say that the Bishops made any such *Observations*. For, let the *Fidelity of that Historian*, which he has done nothing to lessen, be what it will, this Writer knows very well that *these Acts* were much more easie to come at, than those of the Lower House, which were long detained even from the Archbishop himself, when he sent to demand them, as may be seen at large in the former Account. They were kept, at least a great part of that time, in a private hand, at such a Distance from Town, as made it more particularly difficult for any Member, that differ'd from the Majority, to see them:

B: 29. 30.

Page 9.

P: 52, 53. &c.

them: no one of that side being allow'd to have them at all in his keeping. I cannot say any Member was deny'd the sight of them, tho I know but one of the lesser Number that attempted to see them in these Circumstances; who some time the last year was, as he has owned, received with Civility, and permitted to take some Notes out of them.

The Upper-House Books have been always ready, in their proper place, to be freely inspected by any one that had occasion to see them; and therefore this Writer, who complains here that the Clergy never received any Answer to this Paper, ought either to have taken the printed *Observations* for true, or examined the *Register* and have consider'd them accordingly. And either way he ought to have owned, that the Archbishop and Bishops alledged for their Conduct in the matter of the Address, *That they did no more than what was done by their Predecessors, and submitted to by the Clergy in 1689. which being the first Precedent of that Nature upon their Books, they thought a proper Rule for the whole Convocation now,* and he should have shewn why it was not. He should also have consider'd the other Precedents the Bishops refer to *for their directing matters to be reconsider'd,* and have endeavour'd at least to take off the Force of them, as well as the Reasons there urged for expecting the Clergy's Agreement or particular Exceptions, notwithstanding their general Dissent. For how sufficient soever this general Dissent may be in other Assemblies of two Houses, where I believe it is never thought very decent, nor ordinarily practis'd; it can no way be suitable to that Relation there is between Bishops and Clergy, and which, as the Bishops justly observe, remains between them when assembled in a Synod.

Former Account, P. 38.

There are other things in these Observations that should not have been overlook'd by this Writer in so scornful a manner: but I shall refer the Reader and him to the rest, and add only one Observation more on that Paper as he has reprinted it.

In the last Paragraph but one, pag. 9. they say, *That however your Lordships may think us blameable for not bringing up Exceptions when demanded, yet we hope that, even in your Lordships Judgment, we shall be acquitted of all Blame, if we did not offer our Reasons before they were demanded.* This is worded with such an Air of Derision, as if they thought they had the Bishops at some monstrous Absurdity. But why might not the Bishops blame you for not bringing up your Exceptions before they were particularly demanded, if in all reason you ought to have brought them up when you refused their Address? And yet the Bishops did no otherwise blame you for not coming up the first time without them, than by making it a Reason why they could not receive your Address, and taking occasion from it to demand particular Exceptions to that they had sent. And for this, occasion enough had been given them, by that Message which the Prolocutor deliver'd, when he presented the Lower House Address, and which this Writer has printed after the Address, tho it was deliver'd before it. For by that Message the Bishops were inform'd that the Lower House had disagreed to the Address they sent down, and brought up a new one of their own, without offering at any Alterations to be made to the Bishops Address, in order to their agreeing upon it.

There was therefore no ground for this part of their Decent Reply; but I suppose it proceeded from some of that Reverence which this Writer professes to bear towards our Spiritual Fathers, when having in his Preface, with relation to this Address, referred us to what our Saviour said upon the Subject of Prayer, *If a Son shall ask Bread of any of you that is a Father, will he give him a Stone; or if he ask a Fish, will he for a Fish give him a Serpent? or if he shall ask an Egg, will he give him a Scorpion?* he forbears to make the Application himself, but leaves that to his Reader. His Reader indeed is much obliged to him for leaving so coarse a Business upon him; as the Bishops

Bishops are for that Application, which he thought he had left plain enough to be made.

If one was to be so nice as they are; one might possibly question the Exactness of this Application, had the main ground of it been true. But what pretence is there for comparing the most discriminating Clauses in the Bishops Address to *Stones, and Serpents, and Scorpions*? was it so hard or so terrible a thing to blame those that raised and kept up the Popular Clamour of the Church its being in particular *Danger*? one would be apt to think it should not be so to those who did not go into the Clamour themselves; nor can I see how complying with the Address could turn to the Reproach of the Clergy, if they were clear of that Blame. Indeed I suppose, as I think I have reason, that he is speaking here of the *Rejected Address*; for sure he could not say such cruel things of that to which they concurred: and yet I know of no other complying, which turned to the Reproach of the Clergy; but that indeed put People upon wondering, as I observed before, at the Cause of the Change.

I am weary of following such a Train of *Reproaches and Cavils* as these; but must go on to see whether any better Objections are brought against the Protestation of some Members of the Lower House against the Proceedings of the Majority, which is the next Head of this Writer's Complaint.

This Writer has made, at first setting out, one very mean Attempt to lessen the Credit of this Protestation, by crowding up the Protesters into two Columns, and less than a Page, under a Small Character, and without the signs of any Christian Name; while his own *Counter-Declarers* are set out with great Pomp, and take up almost three Pages. I should not have taken notice of so contemptible a Practice, but that this Writer, who is such an Enemy to all *Artifice*, if you will believe him, seems to have industriously designed it: for he has no *Original* or *Printed Paper* to warrant his

The Protestation.

Copy;

Copy; and tho' he undertakes only for the *Original Papers and Acts of the Lower House*, amongst which he will not, to be sure, do the *Protestation* the Honour to reckon it one; yet since he would print it, he ought to have given it entire, and not with naked Surnames, that familiar way in which he pretends to expose it.

However I am persuaded that no body will think the worse of the *Protestation* or *Protesters* for this: and I am also willing to hope that the Credit of both will be safe after all the *Objections*, that, according to this Writer's boasting, were so solemnly drawn up in the House, and signed by such numbers of Members against them; when those *Objections* have been duly examined.

The Preamble of the *Protestation* sets forth the Reason and Ground of it, in the gentlest Terms that the Nature of the thing would bear. As they looked upon several new Principles and Practices of the Lower House to be Innovations contrary to the Duty of Presbyters, and tending to break the Unity of the Synod; so they thought themselves obliged to declare their Dissent publicly, that it might appear that there were several Members of the Lower House, who had no part in those Claims: and considering the Opinion they were of, it was hardly possible for them to say or do less than they did.

But now if we look into the Preamble of the Complaint of the Lower House upon this Occasion, we shall find them directly charging the Bishops with *Encouraging unwarrantable Methods, for the reviving and enflaming those Differences, and thereby defeating all the good Ends of our Synodical Assemblies*. They profess themselves greatly surpriz'd to find that after an absolute Refusal to receive a Paper regularly drawn up, and offered by them, the Bishops should accept one from other Members irregularly contrived and signed. The Paper they mean was their Address, which, as has already been shewn, was not so regularly drawn up and offered as they pretend. Nor is it so just to say, that that was absolutely refused by the Bishops

Bishops, which was refused by them, because the Lower House in so unusual a manner rejected what came from the Upper; as it is to say, that they of the Lower House did absolutely refuse the Address of the Archbishop and Bishops, who refused it in the first Instance, and without making any particular Exceptions against it.

How irregularly the Protestation was contriv'd and signed, shall be considered when I come to their Observations upon it, who have not yet done with their Complaints against the Bishops themselves. In the next Paragraph they say, that *the Approbation given by their Lordships to this Attempt, is as extraordinary as the Attempt itself: for their Lordships have thereby taken upon them to condemn their House unheard, even whilst it was actually sitting, contrary to the known Rules of Equity, which in all Cases ought to take place, and which they doubt not their Lordships would have observed, had a Complaint been exhibited by the House against any one of those protesting Members.* Here is a flat Charge of Injustice and Partiality laid on the Bishops, grounded on no other Fact than their receiving the Protestation; all the rest being made up of the meer Presumption of the Lower House, that the Bishops would not have received any Complaint from them, against any of their Members. But both this Fact is wrong stated, and the Presumption annexed to it undutiful and groundless. The receiving the Protestation is called a condemning of the House unheard, neither of which can justly be said; for neither was the Protestation it self in the Form or Design of it an Accusation of the House, but only a Declaration of the Dissent of such Members to the Proceedings of the House, to keep themselves from being involved in them; nor did they pray any legal Course to be taken for the censuring of those, whose Practices they thought Innovations, but only that their Protestation against them might be entred in the Acts of the Upper House. Had the Protestation been of the Nature and Form of an Accusation, and intended to be prosecuted.

prosecuted as such, the bare receiving it had not been a condemning of the House, for it must have been received in order to be tried whether it was a just one or no; and had any previous Knowledge in the Bishops of the truth of the Matters complained of been necessary to the barely receiving it, as it was not, there was nothing complained of in this Protestation, but what the Bishops themselves had often complained of before; and thereby made it the Duty of those Members, who disapproved those Proceedings, to let it appear that they did it, both in regard to the Bishops and themselves. So that it was hardly possible to assert any thing more entirely wrong, than that the Bishops *Approbation of the Protestation was a condemning the Lower House unheard.* And if this was wrong, it must be more inexcusably so to suggest upon it, that the Bishops would not have received a Complaint from the Lower House, had such an one been exhibited against any one of the Protesting Members. For this I am sure is taking upon them to say, without any pretence of Evidence to support it, that the Bishops would have deny'd them that in the Case of a Member of the Lower House, which they very well know they did not deny them in the Case of more than one of their own Order.

It is with as little Justice, that their Lordships are charged, in the next Paragraph, with *Widening the Breaches, by countenancing the restless Attempts of some private Men, who refuse to acquiesce in the declared Sense of the House.* If the bare Resolution of the Lower House was indeed sufficient to make a Rule of Convocation, where it did not find one, in bar of the Archbishop and Bishops Authority, or against a former settled Rule; there would be more appearance of ground to call those Members *restless*, that did not acquiesce in such Resolutions; tho, even in this Case, it would be just and fit for such Members to protest against them, if they sincerely thought them prejudicial to the State of an Episcopal Church. But when they cannot but know there is n

such Power in the Lower House, it is as absurd; as it is injurious, to call those Members *restless* who think it their Duty to oppose such Attempts: and the expecting their Acquiescence in this Case, is certainly aiming at Victory not Accommodation.

The rest of the Paragraph is a repeated Reproach on the Bishops, for having had *no Regard to their earnest and reiterated Proposals* for ending all Disputes, either by a *Verbal Conference*, or a *joint Reference to any competent Authority*. Both these Proposals have been consider'd already, and therefore I shall only observe in this place, that had they themselves had any regard to the latter, which they would be thought to have, *Her Majesties* graciously deferring her Answer to their Separate Petition, and the *Letters* she was afterwards pleas'd to send to this Convocation, would have had another Effect upon their *Pretensions* than we have hitherto found. For tho this Complaint was drawn up before either of those *Royal Letters* were sent, yet it is published long after the Receipt of both of them, and this Writer *hopes and verily believes that not one of the subscribing Members has alter'd his Opinion in these points.*

P. 146

P. 225

One would have thought that they who had apply'd to Her Majesty, should have had so much regard to her Letter, as to have been a little stagger'd by it at least; when they could not but see in it a tender and gentle Reproof of their *not enough regarding Her Majesties Supremacy, and the due Subordination of Presbyters to Bishops.* But as their intermediate Sessions, appointed on the Day of this Complaint, *Febr. 1.* and held frequently in this Month, seem to have been the chief occasion of Her Majesties interposing in so mild and gracious a manner; so they were so far from regarding this Letter, that they returned to their own House, after they were prorogued in the Upper, in Obedience to it, and did what we observed before on that day *Mar. 1.* and in two intermediate Sessions, which they held the *17th* and *13th* of the same Month.

This Letter, tho it came within the compass of the matters he treats of, and was of near Concern to the Convocation Disputes, and directed to be communicated to the Lower House, was not it seems one of those *Original Pa-*

pers, which this Writer thought fit to publish, to vindicate the Reputation, clear the good Intentions of the Lower House in their Difference with the Bishops about the Form of an Address, the general Assertion of their Rights, and their Attempts to proceed upon Business. And therefore I will beg leave to publish it here.

To the most Reverend Father in God, Our Right Trusty and Right Entirely Beloved Counsellour, Thomas Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England and Metropolitan, and President of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury.

A N N E R.

MOST Reverend Father in God, our Right Trusty and Right Entirely Beloved Counsellour, We greet you well. We are much concerned, that the Differences in Convocation are still kept up, and are rather increased than abated: And we are the more surprized at this unhappy State of things, because it has been our constant Care and Endeavour, as it ever shall be, to preserve the Constitution of the Church of England as by Law established, and to discountenance all Divisions and Innovations whatsoever. In particular, We are resolved to maintain our Supremacy, and the due Subordination of Presbyters to Bishops, as the Fundamental parts thereof; and we expect that you and your Suffragans do act conformably to this Our Resolution; and in so doing you may be sure of the continuance of our Protection and Favour. Nor shall either of them be wanting to any of the Clergy, whilst they are true to the Constitution, and Dutiful to Us, and their Ecclesiastical Superiors, and preserve such a Temper as becomes all, but especially those who are in Holy Orders. This our Pleasure

Sure We require you to communicate to the Bishops and Clergy of the Convocation of your Province. And seeing the Convocation stands prorogued to the first of March next, We direct you, when that Day comes, to prorogue it to such further time, as shall appear to be convenient. And so we bid you heartily farewell.

Given at our Court at Kensington the 25th Day of February 1705, in the Fourth Year of our Reign.

By her Majesties Command.

C. Hedges.

One would have thought, that a Letter from Her Majesty, whom they themselves had apply'd to before, should upon this Occasion have had more weight with them: But tho' they returned to their own House, as I observed, after they had been prorogued in the Upper, pursuant to Her Majesties Commands, We find no notice taken of it there, not so much as an Entry of any Prorogation of the Convocation that Day, as there ought to have been, and as there is, *Mar. 30. 1707*, when the Convocation was prorogued in the Upper House, pursuant to Her Majesties Writ.

On *Mar. 7. 1705*, in an intermediate Session they produced a Copy of Her Majesties Letter, and appointed a Committee to consider what might be proper for the House to do in relation to it, in order to the expressing all Respect and Duty to Her Majesty. This was mighty well thought on, in a Session that was an Act of Disobedience to Her Majesty, who had ordered the Archbishop to prorogue the Convocation, to such further time as he should think fit, as it was accordingly prorogued to *Mar. 21*, beyond those two Days in *March* on which these Members assembled.

We find no more of this Matter in the Lower House Books; but this Writer knows what sort of an Address was prepared upon this Occasion, and what Methods were taken without doors to bring the Prolocutor into it, who wisely with-

April 3

stood the *Powerful Solicitations* that were used to make him comply.

But I must hasten to the long Train of Objections drawn up against the poor *Protestation*, and which opens with those that are said to lie against it in *Form*. They say that the *Protestation* was first produced in the *Lower House*, when most of their Members were gone into the Country, upon account of the approaching Festival; And what if they were? this *Protestation* had no immediate relation to them, but only to the Protesters themselves, who desired only to have this Testimony of their Sense remain on the Books: And how many soever were gone into the Country, there were it seems still enough left to over-rule this Motion, and hinder not only the lodging, but even the reading of this *Protestation*. What was therefore to be expected from a fuller Meeting? a more favourable receiving it, or such a Censure of it, as we have at present before us? I think it requires no great Sagacity to guess. The Question before the House, was only whether it should be receiv'd or not; and as the Members concerned, met with nothing but Interruption in offering it, they had no reason to wait the Pleasure of a fuller House, for the obtaining that Justice which had upon like Cases been hitherto denied them. And therefore, the carrying the *Protestation* to the Upper House, when they had been hinder'd from reading it in the Lower, and when it was proposed to adjourn it to a full Meeting by those, who had Number enough to put it off thus, and did, in the Conclusion of the Debate, accordingly adjourn it; was not a disorderly withdrawing it as this Complaint represents. For the House was never in the Possession of it; and their refusing to receive it, at least for the present, as it was reason enough for the Archbishop and Bishops to admit it, so it must clear the Protesters from being guilty of any false Suggestion, in saying it was so refused; a Crime which this Complaint would lay to their Charge. But the History of this Transaction is so particularly deliver'd in the former Account, and the Entry of the Lower House about it so justly corrected, that I will not detain the Reader with any further Defence in this Place; hoping, that if he wants more Satisfaction, he will look in-

to

Objections against the Protestation in point of Form.
Page 14.
1 Obj.

to the Account above-mentioned, as hard things as the Complainers have been pleased to say of it.

The next Observation is, That of *Forty nine Persons, whose Names are affixed to this Protestation, all, except seventeen, Protest by Proxy; a practice they think not to be justified, since in those Assemblies, where voting by Proxies for good Reasons obtains, Protesting by Proxy has for as good Reasons been always disallowed.* But this Exception, which is the most plausible of any here made in point of Form, will not I believe appear very considerable, upon a just view of the Difference between the Lower House of Convocation, and other Assemblies where Protestations are used. 2 Obj.

The Members of the Lower House have settled Rules for their Proceedings there, and are accountable to their Superiours for the Observance of them, and consequently more concerned to keep themselves from being involved in Practices which they think irregular, than the Members of other Assemblies are, who run no hazard by being included in the Majority. Upon this account, the Members who had all along differed from the Majority, in those Disputes that divided the Houses, found themselves under a Necessity of declaring their Dissent, not to a single Vote or Act, as is the general case of Protesting in other Assemblies, where Protesting is used; but to a whole Course and Series of acting, which they had at several times complained of in the House, without any effect; and so could not well observe the same Forms which were used in Protestations of a different kind. Besides, every Member of the Lower House is obliged to attend, under pain of Suspension, if his Absence is not excused by the Archbishop, and is however so supposed to be there by himself, or his Proxy; so that all are accountable for what passes in the House, if their Dissent to it does not appear. And this makes it necessary for those who are entrusted by others, to do for them, as they do for themselves, which is also agreeable to the Powers we find expressed in general Proxies—*& cetera omnia faciendi quae ipse possem facere, si praesens adessem.*—There was nothing more intended by the Protesters, than to have it appear upon Record, in the best manner they could, that so many of the

the Lower House renounced the Claims that were made by the Majority there; and this might as properly be done by the Members declaring for those who sent them their Proxies, as for themselves.

In the House of Lords in Parliament, no Proxy is admitted, till the Person himself has first appeared; whereas in Convocation the Proxy is accepted instead of the first Appearance; which is enough to keep the Application of the Proxy in Convocation; from being limited by the Orders of the House of Lords. And yet even there, where Proxies are not applied in ordinary Protestations, in the 16th of R. 2. c. 5. upon the Question of procuring *Bulls from Rome*, not only the Archbishops and Bishops, and other Prelates that were present, but the Procurators of those that were absent, were ask'd their Opinions, and they answered accordingly for those that were absent, that it was against the King and his Crown, as contained in the Petition before-named. And these Members themselves that complain, have subscribed this Complaint, and the Claim of their Rights, not only in the Name of themselves who were present, but also in the Names of those whose Proxies they had. I hope therefore, there is nothing so very wrong in the Protesters *declaring their Dissent*, for themselves, and those who sent them their Powers; for that is the first Expression they use in their Paper. And I believe, no one who considers that the Lower House of Convocation has neither Obligation to follow, nor Right to take up the particular Orders of other Assemblies, will think there is such a mighty Difference between Protesting and Declaring, as should make it unjustifiable to Protest there for others against that, against which they might in the Name of others very freely Declare.

3 Obj.

Another Exception is, that these Proxies were not exhibited in the House; which is true, but not to the Purpose, because they were exhibited to the Archbishop, where they ought of right to be exhibited; and by him admitted before they were offered in the House: Whereas the Proxies applied to this Complaint, were not so exhibited, and consequently could not justly be used.

They

They go on and except, *that had they been duly exhibited, yet they could not reasonably be applied to a Case of so singular a Nature, without special Direction from the Persons, whose Powers they were.* But neither was the Case of so singular a Nature, as to require such special Direction, nor did the Members who applied the Proxies, want sufficient Assurance of their being applied according to the Mind of the Persons that sent them. For the four first Heads of the Protestation, consisted of things that had been often disagreed to before, and made up the Subject of those Disputes, that had been, both by talking and writing, on each side of the Question, sufficiently published to the World; especially to all that thought themselves concerned in Convocation Affairs. And therefore when it was notorious to all, especially to those of the House, on which side of their Questions the several Members engaged; their sending their Proxies to such particular Members, was a sufficient Declaration of their own Judgment, concerning all the main things that had been in Dispute.

As to the fifth thing mentioned in the Protestation, which was indeed in one respect of a very irregular Nature, it is introduced in a very different manner from the four that preceded. The Protesters say, *they think fit in the last place to take notice of the disrespectful and undutiful Carriage of the House to the Archbishop and Bishops, in rejecting an Address to Her Majesty, sent down by their Lordships, without making any Exceptions to it, and insisting finally on one drawn up by themselves, contrary to the Method observed in these Cases in all former Convocations.* And it was taken notice of, not as entering into the Merits of either Address, but only observing the extraordinary manner of rejecting that which came from the Bishops, as a further instance of Claims made in the Lower House, to the Prejudice of that Regard, which that House in all former Convocations paid to the Upper. And as I cannot help thinking that it must appear so to all indifferent Men, so I am not aware that any Member, whose Name was made use of in this Protestation, has approved that manner of proceeding, which is the only thing the Protestation complains of, and is of a piece with those other Proceedings, which

all the Protesters, whether present or absent, have freely declared their Opinion against.

By these Complaints insisting so much upon *special Direction* for the Application of Proxies, one would be led to imagine, that when they applied the Proxies of two Right Reverend Bishops to this Complaint, which at the beginning, as I have already observed, charges the Upper House with *Partiality, Injustice, enflaming the Disputes, and countenancing Restless Attempts*, one would be tempted I say to imagine, that they had the special Direction of those Prelates, in a case of so singular a Nature; And yet it is not easie to think that those Right Reverend Bishops should direct those Presbyters they honour'd with their general Powers, to lay so grievous a Charge upon their Brethren of the Upper House, nor will I believe it without more particular Authority; as bold a thing as it must be in their Proxies to subscribe their Names in this Case of themselves.

3 Obj.

The Complainers mention one Instance of the Abuse of their general Powers in the Lower House, in the Case of an *Ancient Member, brought in as protesting against those Proceedings, which he had when present concurred in*: Now not to insist that that Member has been heard to blame those Proceedings as going too far, even when he had not strength enough to keep himself from being born down by the Tyde; it is reasonable to suppose, that he was come to a Resolution of acting upon a different Foot, when he gave his *Procuratorium* to one, who he well knew had done so all along. I could tell this Writer of another Ancient Member since dead, that declared his Intention to one of these Protesters, of leaving his Proxy with him in a former Convocation, as being of the same Mind; who, before he went of Town, was over-perswaded to leave it with those, whose Proceedings he then disapproved. If the *Procuratorium* of the Ancient Member he mentions, was dated before the Call of the Convocation, it was no doubt in Strictness invalid, tho' still an Argument of that Member's Intentions, to act differently from what he had done. But I would not advise this Writer to be too nice in detecting such Invalidities, lest the Number of his Friends should be too much diminished thereby.

The

The next Exception is, *That some of the Protesters, who* 6 *Obj. Answ.*
signed in their own Names, were not in the House when the Prote-
station was offered. This also is true, but of no great impor-
 tance, when it is consider'd the Protestation was signed out
 of the House by the greater Number, above a day before it
 was offer'd, in the best manner the Circumstances of the
 Protesters, who had been formerly deny'd the Liberty of
 Protesting in the House, would at that juncture bear. By
 this means it was signed by some then in Town, who were
 not able to be at the House on the day it was offer'd. Dr.
Trimnell in particular was hinder'd by Sickness from coming
 that Morning, when he designed to be there; and Dr. *Asb-*
ton, whose Proxy he apply'd upon Thursday, was there up-
 on Saturday, as the Complainers observe, coming unexpect-
 edly to Town the Evening before. But the Protestation
 was shewn him before it was carry'd up to the Bishops,
 and it was proposed to him to strike out his Name, if he
 did not approve it: and he as readily agreed to all those Arti-
 cles about which the Controversie had hitherto been: so,
 whatever Exceptions he had to the last Article of the Address,
 as seeming at first to be foreign to the chief matter in hand,
 they did not hinder him from allowing the Protestation to
 go as it stood. There was therefore nothing particular in
 this case, that was not purely accidental, nor any thing that
 hinder'd Dr. *Trimnell* and Dr. *Ashton* from being both of
 them Disapprovers of those Proceedings of the Lower House,
 that had been, and still are, the Subject of their greatest
 Disputes.

Another Exception is, *That some Persons who have Suffrages* 7 *Obj. Answ.*
solely in their own Right, and not as representing others, do yet,
by virtue of several Dignities, protest by different Proctors, which
Artificial Method of multiplying Subscriptions, does not in reality
increase the Number of the Subscribers, or add any thing to the
Weight of the Protestation. To which I answer, That there
 was no Art in thus ordering the Protestations for the Increase
 of the Number; which had been just the same, and answer'd
 the End of the Protesters as well, had those Persons of dou-
 ble Capacities protested by the same Proctor: the only thing
 that govern'd them in this, was distributing the Proxies more
 H equally

equally among the Members in Town. But there was *not* in making this Method blameable in respect of those only who had *Suffrages solely in their own Right, and not as representing others*; for by means of this Distinction, Dr. Delaune, as Proctor of the Chapter of Winton, and of the Diocese of Oxon, may fairly multiply Subscriptions, and I suppose, in the sense of the Complainers, *in reality increase their Number*, and add to the Weight of their Complaint. But I believe every body else will think that Dr. Prideaux, as Dean of Norwich and Archdeacon of Suffolk, is of as much Number and Weight as Dr. Delaune, with his double *Procuratorium*, is in the Complaint.

s Obj. Ans. The last Exception in point of Form is, *that several Bishops by Virtue of their Commendams subscribe the Protestation*: and do not Bishops also by virtue of like Commendams subscribe their Complaint? and is not the Authority in both Cases the same, and would not their Suffrages in the House be equally good given on each side of the Matter in question? Would these Complainers take upon them to set aside the Votes of these Bishops whose Proxies are apply'd against the Majority, because they were in favour of the Upper House? I believe they would not, as little as they are disposed to allow the Bishops to do any thing in Defence of their own Rights; while they give them leave, as we see, to do as much as they please in Diminution of them, if they do not make them, as we have more reason to think, do even more than they like.

After all the Exceptions then in point of Form, I think it must be confessed that the Protestation had the Effect and Force of Forty nine Suffrages to support it, offered in the best manner the Circumstances of the Protesters would bear: and therefore I will go on to consider, how far the other Exceptions they make to several Passages in it, may be thought to take off the Force of it.

Objections against Passages in the Protestation answered.

Ob. 1

Ans.

The first is, that the Protesters observe with great Grief what for some Years hath passed in Convocation: an Observation, says the Complaint, *not very obvious to those, who were never Members of any preceeding Convocation, nor ever appeared in this.* But to make this Observation of the Protesters appear thus absurd, as they would be thought to have shewn it, they have

have altered the Words of the Protestation, as well as the Position of them. The Words of the Protestation as printed by this Writer, are these. We——*have observed with great Grief, that for some Tears last past, several new Principles and Practices have been introduced into this House, &c.* And could no body observe this, but they who had been in the House? Had not the Proceedings of the House in all the late Convocations been published on both sides with their several Arguments upon them? and had not all the perfect Registers of Convocation, since the Reformation, been also published in the *Synodus Anglicana*, with Discourses upon the several Questions that had been disputed, referring to those and more ancient Registers, by which all that cared to examine these Matters might satisfy themselves? And does not this Writer well know, that Archdeacon Bull in particular, who is here mentioned, and was written to accordingly by one of the Complainers, vindicated himself in a full and unanswerable Letter? and why then is this Observation represented so absurd, and why do we find the Names of several Members in the like Circumstances applied to this formal Complaint? For instance, Dr. Ullock, and Mr. Fox; who tho' Members of every Convocation from the very beginning of these Disputes, the first as Dean of Rochester, the second as Archdeacon of Hereford, were never present in any one Session: Mr. Jenkyns, a Member in the Convocation of 1700, and chosen again in 1705, but he never gave his Attendance in either: Mr. Waldron who had not been a Member in any former Convocation, nor had ever been present in this last, when their Complaint was signed: and Mr. Hill, a Member of every Convocation from the year 1700, but present in none, except four or five Sessions of the short Meeting in 1701.

Persons not present in Convocation, might know the State of the Disputes there.

Were these and others who rarely attended but when it was to serve a turn, better informed that *unwarrantable Methods were still practised by some Members of the Lower House, and openly encourag'd by the Bishops?* were they better able to judge of the Regularity with which the Address was drawn up and offered by the Lower House, and of the absolute manner in which the Bishops refused it? Could they be in a Condition to charge them with condemning the Lower House unheard, and

of doing that by Partiality, *contrary to the known Rules of Equity, which they would have observed in another Case?*

The Objection therefore, if it had any weight, would fall as heavy upon many of their own Members, as upon ours. But it is, in truth, of no weight against either: since nothing can be more evident, to any impartial Man, than that a deliberate *reading and comparing* of the Arguments on both sides, as they have been printed at large, is a much surer way to form a right Judgment of the Merits of the Cause, and of the several Branches of it, than an occasional, or even a constant Attendance at the Debates of the House; and especially on their intermediate Days, when none could attend, but the Members of their own side, and so their Work, we may believe, was rather *resolving* than *debating*.

I pass on to the next Exception; and that will appear to stand upon the same precarious Foundation.

Obj. 2.
Page 16.
Answ.

They say, *That from such Persons they suppose that Suggestion to proceed, which intimates a willingness to do Business on the side of the Protesters, and an Indisposition to it on theirs. Since none who were not utter Strangers to their Proceedings, could be ignorant, that all possible Steps towards Business, had been all along taken by their side, and all possible Obstructions as constantly given on the side of the Protesters: To which evil purpose, they cannot but think the Protestation was chiefly intended.* It has already been shewn, that many Men might be, and accordingly were, very well acquainted with the Proceedings of Convocation, who had neither been of former Convocations, nor appeared in this; and at least as good Judges on one side of the Question, as any of the Complainers in like Circumstances could be on the other; so that this Exception is entirely frivolous. And the Pretence of Zeal for Business on one side, has also been considered already. The Protesters have never been unwilling to enter on any Business, that should be duly proposed, and carried on in a regular manner; but they have always thought, as they express in their Protestation, that the first right step toward this, is settling the Methods of doing it, in such a manner as might encourage their Superiours to lay it before them; and running upon Business without adjusting these necessary Preliminaries, is not to pro-

more,

mote, but to hinder it. As this is the true State of the Case, so hardly any body can be so utter a Stranger to it, as not to see by whom the regular Steps have been taken, and that it is very unjust to charge the Protestation, as designed to hinder Business, when it was plainly intended to introduce the true and ancient Method of doing it.

In the next Paragraph they think they have a mighty *Obj. 3.* Advantage against the Protesters, as saying, *that the Practi- Answ.* ces by them complained of are still kept up; whereas the holding Intermediate Sessions, putting the Prolocutor in the Chair, and giving leave of Absence to their Members, had been for Peace sake intermitted: But to get this seeming Advantage, the Protestation is mis-represented; for the Words of that are, *these new Pretensions and Practices are still kept up*; and I will leave any Man to judge, if they were not kept up in the manner which the Protestation set forth. It says, *that the Prolocutor prorogued the House, with the Consent, and by the Authority of the House it self, &c. the effect of which had been in late Convocations, intermediate Sessions*; it does not say it was so in this, but that it might be so again, whenever the House pleased; and the House we see was pleased to return to them again, very quickly after in this Convocation. The other Articles of putting the Prolocutor in the Chair, and giving leave of Absence, are not laid to their Charge, as just then practised, but as still pretended to; as that of *electing an Actuary* was all along claimed, tho' first formally exercised in this Convocation: And that of *dissenting without Excep- Collect. of Pa-* tion to their Lordships Address, is mentioned, as I observed be- pers, Num. 18. fore, only as a new Instance of *disrespectful and undutiful Carriage*. And therefore I cannot see that the Protesters gave any fair occasion for such Exceptions as these, but the Complainers have given them just Cause to complain of their being mis-represented.

Another wonderful Exception to the Protestation is, that *Obj. 4.* it distinguishes between the *Lower House*, and the *whole Lower Answ.* House: Whereas I thought it had been the very Business of all Protestations to make that Distinction, (*viz.*) to shew that there were several in that Assembly, where such a thing prevailed, who did not concur in it. And they might, one would

would have thought, have let this Distinction pass, since they could use it to their own Advantage, as they tell us, in the Upper House, especially considering that this Distinction was made before by the Author of the Power of the Lower House, &c. *I have one Request*, says that Author, *to leave with the Reader, that wherever in these Papers I mention the Bishops, as opposing the Claims of the Lower Clergy, he would understand me, not of the whole Bench, but only of a large Majority of them.*

This methinks should be Authority enough for any Members of the Lower House, to make it appear, as they see occasion, that what is claimed there, is not claimed by the whole House, but only by a Majority of them, and that no very large one.

Obj: 5. Answ. It is as extraordinary, their calling the *Unity of the Synod* in the next Exception, a *new-fangled Term*; whereas all that is new in it, is owing to the new occasion they have given for the use of it: And they would hardly have treated a thing of that Consequence with so much Contempt, had they been truly concerned to preserve it. There is no other *Unity* contended for by the Protesters, but that Subordination of the Lower House to the Upper, and that Correspondence between them, which the Forms and Usages of the Constitution direct: And they who take it ill, to be put in mind of preserving *such a Unity of the Synod as this*, would perhaps have been more offended, had they been told of the regard that ought to be had to the *Unity of the Church*, tho' they could not have called it a *new-fangled Term*.

For they know that all the Ancient Notions of the Unity of the Church, would have pleaded for another sort of Dependence of Presbyters upon Bishops in Council, than is insisted on here, as ignorant as they represent the Protesters in the next Paragraph, for saying, *that the Presbyters of this Church do enjoy greater Powers in Provincial Synods, than Presbyters have ever enjoy'd in any other Episcopal Church.*

When those good Authorities which they say they could offer to shew that *from the first Ages, Presbyters did sit, give Voice, and subscribe in Provincial Synods, as well as Bishops,* are fairly produced, they shall be as fairly considered. At
pre-

present they instance only in the Church of Ireland, which methinks is the less proper Example, for the Reason which this Writer furnishes us with (*viz.*) *that the Irish Convoca- Page 30. tion, as well as Parliament, is known to have been entirely formed upon that of England.* It is certainly so much under the same Laws and Customs, from having the same Head with this here, that it is hardly fit to be mentioned as another, when we are comparing the Privileges which Presbyters enjoy here by *Law and Custom* (as the Protestation expresses it, tho' the Complaint leaves it out) with what they enjoy in other Episcopal Churches at large. And whether the Presbyters there do, by Law and Custom, enjoy those very Rights and Privileges which the Protesters disclaim here, as the Complainers must mean, if they would say any thing to the Purpose, shall be considered in its proper place.

I am now come almost to the End of the Complainer's Exceptions, none of which have appeared very formidable; but those with which they have chosen to close up their Paper, seem to come behind the other as much in Weight, as they do in their Order.

They charge the Protesters as disingenuous for *suggesting*, *Obj. 6. Answer.* that the Lower House finally insisted upon the Bishops Concurrence with their Address: But all this is a Suggestion of their own; for the Words of the Protestation are, *Rejecting an Address sent down by their Lordships, and insisting finally upon one drawn up by themselves.* And did they not do so? They must at least own, *that they insisted finally upon the Bishops receiving it;* and that I think without any Gloss, was insisting finally upon it. The Protestation said nothing of Concurrence, nor had it any need so much as to suggest it; the other was to all Intents and Purposes the same; they absolutely refused the Bishops, and stuck to their own, which is all the Protestation speaks of, as wanting Respect.

But the finishing Exception of all would make one smile, if one did not constrain ones self, in regard to the House. *Obj. 7. Answer.* They say, *That had the Protesters attended to what had been done in this Convocation, they would not have ventured to scatter throughout their Paper, Insinuations of Danger to the Clergy, and to the State of Episcopacy, lest they should have fallen within the Reach*

Reach of their Lordships Censure, who had been pleased to declare, that to insinuate the Church of England to be in Danger, can proceed from nothing but Prejudice, Interest and Ambition. They did attend, and yet did not think they incurred any Censure by any Danger the Protestation insinuated, because it was as foreign to that Danger, which was then in Question, and which both Houses of Parliament cleared themselves from entertaining any Apprehensions of, as the Danger we confess our selves in from our unhappy Divisions, in the Prayers of our Fasts; under which a Member covered his Dissent, when this Question depended.

The Request
of the Com-
plainers con-
sidered.

These Complaints and Observations end with depending on their Lordships Justice, that they will either order the Protestation signed by some of their Members to be erased out of their Books, or suffer this Reply, together with their Declaration of Rights, to be therewith enter'd and transmitted to Posterity. But the House being prevented lodging their Papers with the Bishops, by Adjournments of their House, according to this Writer's truly new-fangled Term and Thing, he communicates them to their Lordships, by communicating them to the World; and seeing this Paper of Exceptions is one of those Original Papers which he prints for the Reputation of the House, I am contented they should enjoy all the Honour they can receive from it.

Page 25.

Let it be compared with the Protestation that occasioned it; and let any one say whether it is in any Degree so in-offensive, as that. The Protesters chuse to draw up their Dissent in this manner, and leave it upon Record once for all, as the least contentious way: whereas had they been to have protested in the Method which the House seem to insist on, as the only regular way, tho' they had always denied them the Liberty of using it; they must have protested every Day they came into the House, as the Adjournments, which the House pretended to make, was, in their Opinion, always irregular, even when Intermediate Sessions were not appointed.

And as they went on this Reason in drawing up the Form, so they contented themselves barely to mention what they thought irregular, without Aggravations, or running out into hard and uncharitable Reflections on those from whom

whom they dissented: whereas the Lower House in their Complaint did, as we have seen, lay heavy Charges on the Bishops, with very Indecent Expressions, barely for receiving this Protestation; and treat their Brethren as *Restless, Absurd, Disingenuous*, and of *Evil Designs*, for offering it to them. We have also seen what unfair Methods have been used in the several parts of this Complaint, to give this Turn to the Protestation, which does by no means belong to it; and if this be *clearing the Good Intentions of the House*, I know not what is discovering the undue Practices of it; unless, perhaps, the *Declaration of Rights*, which was the other Paper occasioned by this Protestation, may have a fuller Claim to it.

For this *Declaration of Rights*, as they call them, is the greatest Justification of the Protestation that could be; in as much as it shews, that the Protesters were not mistaken in saying, *these new Pretensions and Practices were still kept up*; for they profess to take this Occasion of *renewing their Claims* to those very things which the Protesters *disclaimed*; and they say, what this Writer prints in a different Character to be more taken Notice of, *that they are firmly resolved, by all lawful means, to maintain them to the uttermost*.

I know not what lawful Means they intend; but the proper ones seem to be the *Records and Usage of Convocation*, by which they say indeed, that *their Claims are warranted*; but as they neither bring any Proof of this, nor take any Notice of all that has been written against it, it is sufficient to say in Return, that they are not thus warranted, and to refer the Reader to the Books that have been written to shew they were not; and especially to the *Synodus Anglicana*, where he has the best means of judging for himself.

For it would vastly increase the Length of this Paper, which is but too long already, to repeat the whole Controversie, nor does the Occasion of writing it seem to require so much.

I will therefore only take a little Notice of the last of their Claims, *that of finally Dissenting, without specifying Reasons*; because they say, that *the Exercise of that Right can be no Instance of Undutifulness or Disrespect to the Archbishop and Bishops*.

shops. This Claim was first made in their Narrative, p. 61. to justify their Refusal to appoint a Committee, at the Direction of the Archbishop and Bishops, in the first of these late Convocations; and was considered in the *Synodus Anglicana*, with all the Fairness they could desire. That Author has made it appear, that this Negative grew from the Right of the Clergy common with other Subjects, not to be taxed against their Wills, and by Degrees extended it self, so as to hinder any other thing passing into a Synodical Act without their Consent: but that it never extended so far, as to support the Clergy, in refusing to consider Matters referred to them by the Bishops, in the manner which the Bishops proposed.

If we except the single Instance of the Lower House, refusing to appoint a Committee at the Direction of the Upper, in 1689, which is not fit, upon many Accounts, to be used as a Precedent; there have been no Examples produced, of the Lower House dissenting finally to any Business, but that of giving their Money.

And as those Instances were before the Reformation, when the Clergy were often hard pressed, between the Demands of the Pope, and the Wants of the King; so they were attended with such Petitions to be excused upon the Reasons they urged, as should not, one would think, save the Members of the Lower House from being justly charged with Disrespectful and Undutiful Carriage, for absolutely refusing to concur, not in a *Subsidy* or *Canon*, but barely in an *Address* to Her Majesty, sent down by the Archbishop and Bishops, without offering any Exceptions or Amendments; and insisting finally to have one of their own drawing received. If this is reconcileable to that Respect and Duty which Presbyters have always thought themselves obliged to pay to their Bishops assembled in Synod, it is hard to say what is inconsistent with it. And yet this is one of those Claims which the Subscribers say are *Innocent, Reasonable and Warranted by the Usage of Convocation, and what they are resolved, by all lawful means, to maintain to the utmost.*

This Writer boasts much in the *Number and Character of* ^{The Number} the Subscribers, and desires the *Readers to observe, that the* ^{of the Com-} *Subscriptions of the Elective Members are most numerous,* as what ^{plainers consi-} *will afford him a safe Rule of judging how the diffusive Body of* ^{dered. P. 21.} *the Capitular and Rural Clergy are disposed in this Controversie.* But neither is this so sure a Rule of judging; other Considerations often influencing Elections, and a greater Zeal in promoting them being shewn on one side than the other. And if it was as plain a Mark as they say, there is no great occasion for Triumph, in having seven above half the Proctors of the Clergy, and but one above half of the Capitular Proctors, while they have not near half of the Deans or the Archdeacons, which last are the most numerous Rank in the Lower House. And after all, was the Majority greater than it appears to be, a judicious Reader would not put the Merits of the Cause upon that Issue, nor receive the *Impression*, which this Writer expects, *from the Number or Character of his Subscribers,* against the Records of Convocation, and the plain State of an *Episcopal Church.*

As for those who subscribed in the Name of other Members, he says, *they did most (if not all) of them consult their Principals, and receive their particular Directions.* One would have thought that all without Exception should have done it, when at the same time they treated that Omission of it, which they only supposed the Protesters guilty of, as a great Irregularity in them.

But since this Writer, who does not use to be short in affirming, does not undertake for *all*, I am willing to hope that the Poison he has endeavoured to spread, has not taken so much Effect among the diffusive body of the Clergy, as to betray them into an Opinion, that a rude treating of their Ecclesiastical Superiors is the best way of supporting Episcopacy, and retrieving the Honour and Use of Provincial Synods. For Men that give themselves leave to examine, cannot think the Constitution safer for that *profound Reverence for the Episcopal Character,* in which the Subscribers were bred up, as this Writer assures us; while they see *Nature rise up* so much *against Principle,* and Men under all the Professions of Duty, reproaching their Bishops, and lessening, by all the

*Rude treating
the Bishops not
the way to sup-
port Episcopa-
cy.*

ways and means they can think of, their *Established Authority*.

That this is the Case, has I conceive been abundantly proved in the Course of our unhappy Disputes, and I believe more without doors are satisfied of it, than this Writer is willing to own; who writes as confidently as if all his Claims had been made good beyond Contradiction. But he cannot but know it is otherwise: and that till he has offered more to clear himself and his Friends from those Innovations, which have been charged and fully proved upon them, than he has hitherto done; he must take his Quotation out of *St. Augustin* to himself; who has done what he could to change the *Form and Lineaments* of the State Ecclesiastical, and stands up for the Church upon the *Breaches* he has made in it.

*Innovations
charged on the
Bishops, an-
swered.*

But they have not yet done with the Bishops; it seems, that on the same Day, Feb. 1, the Lower House passed also and register'd a third Paper, charging the Archbishop and Bishops with divers Innovations. They themselves best know why they did not subscribe this, as well as the foregoing Papers: but they might with as much Modesty have applied the Proxies of two Right Reverend Bishops to these Imputations, as to those of the first Paper; unless perhaps the part that one of them had in the pretended Innovation of a Bishop's executing the Schedule in what they call the Lower House, withheld them from doing it.

They who passed this Paper, assert, that it had been always their Care to guide themselves by the Usage of Convocation, so far as they had been able to discover it from the remaining Journals: but that the Bishops had not taken the same Care. Of that the World is to judge by what is written already: I cannot here enter into the whole Controversy again, but shall make some Observations upon the Innovations charged on the Bishops.

*1 Charge,
Ans.*

The first concerns the declining to execute the Clause *Premunientes*, according to the Tenor of the royal Writ, and the known Desires and repeated Applications of the Clergy: but I cannot imagine, how this comes to be an Innovation upon the Usage of Convocation, when as the Right Reverend the Bishop of Lincoln has abundantly proved, it has nothing to do with it.

Whatever

Whatever this declining may be towards the Queen, who may have it executed whenever she sees Occasion for it, it ought rather to be thought an instance of Favour in the Bishops towards the Clergy; as not insisting without Necessity on their *Parliamentary Attendance*. If the Clergy indeed think this such a Privilege, as to account themselves injured in its not being required, they have a Right to petition the Bishops for the revival of it, but not as belonging to the Convocation, whose Usages are not affected either by the declining or the execution of that Clause in the Bishops Parliament Writs. For so they ought to have described that Royal Writ to which they refer; but then every body would have seen it was not to their Purpose. Nor do I remember any formal Application of the Clergy to the Bishops for the Execution of this Clause, to secure their *distinct Attendance on Parliament*, as repeated as this Paper says they have been. They do once indeed in a Paper March 10 1701, represent, *that as* Collect. Num. 18. *often as a new Parliament and Convocation are called, the Deans, Archdeacons, Capitular and Diocesan Clergy, have an undoubted Right to be actually summon'd, not only in virtue of her Majesty's Writ of Convocation, &c. but also according to the Tenor of the Clause Premunientes, in the Bishops Parliament Writs, and they complain of the non-execution of that Clause. But as they do not call for this to secure their Attendance on Parliament, so they know the Bishops do not allow that their Parliamentary Writ has any Relation to the Convocation Clergy as such, which are summoned purely upon the Provincial.*

The next is *insisting upon the Clergies Attendance in the Up-² Charge.* *per House before they began each Session in their own*; whereas the Ans. *Archbishop and Bishops did only ask in the fourth Session of the first Convocation, Feb. 28. why they did meet before they attended in that place to which they were prorogued? and when the Prolocutor said that the Lower House was preparing to lay some-^{Hist. of Con} thing before his Grace and their Lordships, concerning Prorogations, &c. the Archbishop said, that he and his Brethren were ready to receive whatsoever should be offered by them, and would consider of it, and do upon it what should appear to them to be Just and Right; but in the mean while he and his Brethren do think fit to continue their present Practice. I think this is no very mighty insisting,* P. 53.

age 7.

insisting; and, as the Narrative owns, this Expectation was mollified into the requiring the Prolocutor only, with some few of the Members: So the same Narrative owns they did not so attend Session 7. March 13. nor after the 8th Session, March 18. nor as they conceived were expected. Thus we see this grievous Attendance, which was expected in so easy a manner, while the Questions were under Consideration, was paid but in three Sessions within the Compass of less than three Weeks, and not afterward expected by the Bishops, tho' their Right of expecting it was never disproved; there appearing at least some Inconvenience in it. With what Justice then, could they at such a distance charge the Archbishop and Bishops with insisting upon the Clergies Attendance in the Upper House before they began each Session in their own? It ought rather to have been remembred as an Instance of Tendernefs and Moderation in the Bishops, their forbearing so soon to expect it any longer; when they had a great deal to say for it.

age 28.

Hist. of Conv.
55.

The latter part of this Article, is, if possible, more unjust than the former, as charging the Archbishop and Bishops with altering the Ancient Form of the Schedule to that end, when that Alteration, which added *vulgò vocat. Jerusalem Chamber*, and was only a just Explication of the Words *in hunc locum*, was made at the desire of the Prolocutor, that the Bishops would explain themselves so, if they desired to be so understood.

Charge.
Answ.

The next Article, (*viz.*) the *Insisting upon the Clergies ending their Sessions below, upon notice that the Upper House was risen*, is worded so obscurely, that no body can tell what to say to it. If they mean by notice, any notice at large, howsoever conveyed, there was no such thing ever insisted on by the Bishops: if they mean the Schedule of Continuation, they know the Bishops have both asserted, and think they have shewn, that the Clergy are to end their Sessions below, upon the Intimation of the Schedule, and by Virtue of it, and the pretending to end them otherwise, is the only Innovation in this Matter.

Charge.
Answ.

The next Charge is, *sending at one time a Bishop, and at another time the Register of the Upper House, down to the Lower, there to execute the Schedule, while the House was actually sitting,*
and

and the Prolocutor in the Chair. As to the sending of a Bishop for this purpose to the Lower House, that is a plain Misrepresentation of a Matter of Fact, and so much the more inexcusable, as it was set right in the *Reflections* upon the Paper Page 16, 17, called the *Expedient*: For there it was shewn, that when the Bishop of Rochester came down, as the Archbishop's Commissary, into the Chapel of H. 7, in 1689; that was not then the Lower House, but truly the *Locus Synodi*, to which the whole Convocation was prorogued; and that consequently the further Continuation of it could not properly be made any where else. And so it was in the Convocation of 1700, when the Bishop of Peterborough came thither with the same Powers to do the same thing. A proper Place was not yet assigned for the Lower House in either of these Cases, and in that of the Bishop of Peterborough, in which we are immediately concerned, it was not to be expected, being the very Day of presenting the Prolocutor, when H. 7th's Chapel could not be otherwise than the Upper House, tho' the Bishops left the Clergy there that Day for present Convenience.

As to the Register's being sent down to execute the Schedule; that single Instance that looked like it; was a Mistake of the Register's, so far as he pretended to it, which is not very clear, and no Direction of the Archbishop and Bishops: Tho' had such a thing been, it had not been quite without a Precedent; for in the 13th and 14th Sessions, according to the Journals of the Lower House in 1588, while Business was before the Convocation, the Prolocutor and others were present, *Quibus facta fuit Intimatio de Continuatione hujusmodi Convocationis*, not *Prolocutor Intimavit* or *Significavit*, as in the rest of the Sessions when he was present.

And this may serve as an Answer to the next Article of sending down the Register to dismiss the Lower House, by signifying to a private Member that the Bishops were risen; in which there is yet a greater Misrepresentation or Mistake, the Bishops having never sent their Register on any such Errand as this.

The next Charge of *refusing a Conference*, has been considered before, and the Demand of it in the Circumstances 5 Charge.
Answ.
in

in which it was asked, was the first and great Innovation.

6 Charge
Ans.

The Justness of *pronouncing the Lower House to be irregular*, which is the next Head of Complaint, depends upon the Merits of the whole Cause; and if these are with the Bishops, as they have reason to think, every one must confess it was just for them to decline treating with their Presbyters, while they found them breaking in upon all the Methods of treating, observed by Presbyters in former Convocations.

What they refer to in saying the *Bishops refused Papers when no such Irregularity was pretended*, I know not; but if they mean their Address, sufficient Reason has been given already, why the Bishops refused to receive it.

7 Charge
Ans.

As little reason have they to complain of the *Archbishop and Bishops expecting that the Messages of the House should be delivered by the Prolocutor*, because he is confirmed in that Office for that very purpose, and they cannot make another Referendary, without the Archbishop and Bishops Consent.

8 Charge
Ans.

For the same Reason, were the Archbishop and Bishops Judges of the Expedience of directing of the Lower House to choose a new Prolocutor upon the Death of the old one, at that time when the former departed; and their deferring to do it toward the end of the Winter, after Feb. 14. when nothing but Disputes were depending, was no just Cause of Complaint.

9 Charge
Ans.

P. 22, 23.

As to the next Charge of *frequent Proroguing by Commissioners who had no other Power*, they were told by the Archbishop, in a Speech since published in the *Complainer further Reproved*, that such Prorogations had often been in the Reign of K. Charles II. when there was no Business by his Order depending in Convocation.

10 Charge
Ans.

The Ordering Papers to be left upon the Table, without any other signifying the Reception of them, and entring upon the Books of the Upper House, Observations upon the Transactions of the Lower, are certainly things in the Breast of the Upper House; nor can they be obliged to give account of them to the Lower. I believe there is no such Expectation in those Parliamentary Assemblies, to which this Writer would have the Convocation bear such Resemblance. And yet the Upper House did
give

give the Lower House notice of former Observations made upon one of their Papers, as I observed before, which ought to have limited at least this General Charge; and if they did not do it in those they made on the Application of the Lower House to have their own Address received, when they rejected that which came from the Bishops, no body had any reason to blame them. They did not pretend to give an Answer to so disrespectful a Paper, but contented themselves to leave their Sense of it upon their Books, where any body had the liberty to see it.

The *unprecedented Length of Prorogations, during the Session of Parliament, is another thing they charge upon the Archbishop and Bishops.* ^{11 Charge} But when they say *unprecedented*; to make it tolerably true, they must mean it of such Times, when the Convocation had Business of Length and Consequence before them, pursuant to a Royal License; for then, it is true, the Distance between Session and Session has been usually short. But at other times, when no Synodical Business was depending (which is the present Case) the Archiepiscopal Prorogations have been long; as in the year 1666, there is one from Oct. 12. to Nov. 9. another from Nov. 9. to Dec. 7; not to mention several others of a later date, but yet antecedent to these Disputes in Convocation; and that, in the Province of York, nothing is more familiar than Prorogations for a Month; tho they are made such a terrible Crime in the Province of Canterbury, by those very Persons who, at the same time, claim a Right to hold *intermediate Sessions* of their own at pleasure. ^{Ans.}

The *pretending to a Jurisdiction over the Lower House, and to a Power of censuring them,* ^{12 Charge} is the next Head of Complaint; ^{Ans.} and a very extraordinary one indeed it is, that the Archbishop and Bishops in Synod, who have it so fully over the Members out of it, should pretend to this Power. But has not this been fully made out in the late *Cause of Contumacy*, which I can assure the Writer has yet a great deal more to support it than has hitherto appeared; tho enough has been said, if not to have prevented this Charge, which was drawn up before that occasion happened, yet at least to have hinder'd its being published now, as if it had no ground to support it.

I shall not trouble the Reader with defending the Archbishop and Bishops against the next Charge of countenancing *Irregular Protestations*, after all that has been said to justify the Protesters, and those that received them.

13th Charge,
Answ.

But I must not pass over their last Charge, upon which they lay such especial Weight (*viz.*) *the Pretence of such a sole Power in the President over the whole Synod, as was altogether unknown to the first and purest Ages of Christianity, as tends to suppress the Rights of the Bishops of this Church as well as the Presbyters, and is inconsistent with the Principles of the most eminent Defenders of the Reformation.*

Account, p. 7.

This is a heavy Charge indeed, but I hope it is not true; because the Reformation and Episcopacy have been both carried on and preserved, by the Exercise of all that the President pretends to, as has been abundantly shewn. And when the Lower House in general owned in one of their Papers, November 1702, the Power of the Archbishop to Prorogue the whole Convocation, as he then claimed it, with the Consent of his Suffragans, they were told by the Bishops, that it was their constant Usage, as appeared by their *Act-Books*. This surely should have hindered the Lower House now, from declaring against the Pretence of such a sole Power in the President, as tends to suppress the Right of the Bishops, had any Regard been had so much as to their own Declarations.

Thus have I gone through their long Catalogue of Recriminations, thrown out without any Reference to the particular Facts they pretend to be grounded upon, or any other Evidence to support them: and I think I have shewn them to be disingenuous, or trifling, at the best. They have so much the Stile and Turn of this Writer, that though they stand among the Acts of the House, I cannot help thinking that one Pen drew them up there, and published them now, with as much Regret as he pretends to have done it. He has shewn, indeed, a wonderful Tenderness in treating the Bishops, and nothing but the *Foul Slanders* (as he calls them) which their Advocate printed, could have extorted this Publication from him.

Had any of those Slanders been detected, which were printed above two Years ago, it had been an Apology for
any

any just Recrimination immediately upon it : but to throw out such a heap of Reproaches after so long time, when no such Injury has been proved, must surely spring from some other Motive than that.

Whether this Writer had a mind to retrieve what he lost, in agreeing to own in a *second Address*, that *the Church was in a safe and flourishing Condition*, by giving us such a dreadful View of its Danger, and defending the Conduct of those who refused to declare against it at first ; or what other true Inducement prevailed, he can best tell, and I will leave it to him, without farther Surmises.

But sure he cannot think that the Members of either House should govern their Conduct by the undue Liberties that the Authors, either of the *Observer* or *Rehearsal*, take with the Affairs of the Church.

Passing therefore these Remarks, which are not worth insisting upon, we come at last to the finishing Support of the *Lower House Cause* (viz.) the *Parallel Customs and Usages of the Lower House of Convocation in Ireland*. Of this it seems an Account was given in Writing, signed by two Members of that House, and this Writer has printed the Copy of it.

Before I trouble the Reader with my own Observations on this Paper, I will present him with the Copy of a Letter I received upon this Occasion, from a Person well acquainted with these Matters.

S I R,

S I N C E I have had the opportunity of being perfectly well informed in the Affairs of the Convocation in Ireland, I do the more readily obey your Commands, and shall give you my Opinion very impartially of the Paper published in a late Pamphlet, entitled *Some Proceedings in the Convocation, A. D. 1705.* faithfully represented ; which Paper is subscribed by W. Percivale Archdeacon of Cashel, and Fran. Higgins Proctor for the Diocese of Ossory.

I must own that I am under a Surprise to find the Author of that Pamphlet make such Arguments and Deductions from that Authority, and the Facts contained in that Paper, which had neither the Consent nor the Knowledge of that House, the Proceedings

whereof it pretends justly to represent: and to see so great a stress laid upon it, as (in the words of the late Archbishop Tillotson) to be thought a Millstone hung on the neck of the opposite Cause; whereas had the Author been truly instructed in the Convocation-Affairs, and the Methods used in Ireland, he would not have ventured his Cause on so precarious a Precedent, which has little else to support it but the present unhappy Controversie in the Convocation of England.

But before I come to the particular consideration of the Merits of that Paper, there are some General Observations, relating to the Affairs of the Convocation of Ireland, which are necessary to be known; in order to judge what Weight or Authority any of their Methods of Proceeding ought to have with an English Convocation.

The Defect of
Registers in
Ireland.

First then, Sir, you are to understand, That there is not one Book or one Paper now remaining, at least not one has yet appear'd, of the Transactions in the Lower House in any former Convocation of Ireland: so that the present Lower House had not the Assistance or Advantage of any sort of Record, or Memoir of their own, to direct them in their Rights, Privileges or Proceedings.

Neither, Secondly, is there any Book or Record of the Upper House now in being, except one, which is that of the Convocation which met in the Year 1661, and sat part of that and the following Year; which Book cannot give full Light into the Affairs of the Lower House, having only an Account of what passed in that House, of which it is presumed to be a faithful Register. But I shall have further Occasion to mention it hereafter.

Neither, Thirdly, is there any Person now living in Ireland, nor has been since the first meeting of the present Convocation there, who was Member of any former Convocation in Ireland, or ever sat in either House, except his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Tuam, who was a Member of the Lower House in 1661; and his Grace being supposed to be now about the Age of 70, must have been a very young Convocation Man at that time; and not pretending to have kept any Papers or Minutes of the House, whereof he was then a Member, 'tis not to be imagined that his Grace will tax his Memory with all the Particulars of this Controversy, since they then never came into Debate, and consequently were not much regarded.

4thly, I would observe that there was an Interval of about 40 Years, between the last and the present Convocation of Ireland; during all which time, I have not heard it alledged or pretended that any Member of either of the present Houses, ever quoted any Discourse or Observation, or Proceeding in that Lower House, from any Person who had been a Member of it.

5thly, I must observe, that some time before the meeting of the Great pains present Convocation in Ireland, abundance of Pains, and Art, taken in Ire- and Industry were used, to make many of the Clergy of that King- land, to propa- dom, apprehensive of dangerous Designs then forming against the gate the Dar- gers of Church Rights of the Church here; and particularly, that some of the and Clergy. Bishops of this Church, were encroaching on the Rights and Privileges of the Lower Clergy; and designed either to enslave them, or make them a useless part of the Convocation. It is not necessary to tell you under what Influence, nor by what concurrent Accidents this Notion began to obtain. It is enough to say, that many did too readily entertain it, and consequently that the Lower Clergy of Ireland were under a strong Disposition, to copy after the Majority of the Lower House here, and to assume those for undoubted Rights and Privileges, which they saw so warmly claimed and defended by their Brethren here, and all under pretence of Zeal for the Establish'd Church.

And lastly, I must observe, that the present Lower House of Convocation in Ireland, were such utter Strangers to all the Usages of Convocation, at their first meeting, that (saving the Matters of Rights which they ever embraced with all imaginable Desire) they had constant recourse for all other Matters to the Synodus Anglicana, and in every Debate submitted to the Decisions of that Book, which lay constantly on the Table.

These general Considerations are sufficient to convince every unprejudiced Man, how absurdly and improperly the Proceedings of the Lower House in Ireland are drag'd in to support that very Original, from which the most of them are copy'd: Not to insist on the several Differences both in Rights and Methods of Proceedings, which may be assigned between a National Convocation, made up of four Provincial Synods, and one Provincial Synod acting under the Direction and Government of its own Metropolitan.

But omitting the disparity and inconsequency of such deductions, I come to consider the Merits of the Paper it self; the History

ry and Representations of which are so very singular, that 'tis impossible to conceal the Manner of its being obtained, or the Artifices by which most of the Facts are Represented to serve one side.

How the Paper, signed by the two Members, was obtained.

As to the History of its being obtained, the Account given in Ireland was to this effect; that the two Eminent Members who Subscribed it, having been some time before in Company with some of the Lower House Members here, happened to talk on the Subject of the Debate between the two Houses; and giving such a Representation of the Proceedings of the Lower House in Ireland, as pleased the Company, they were desired to give the same into the Lower House here, and were invited to do this Service either by a Summons, or by being told how grateful it would be to the Prolocutor and his Friends in the House. Whereupon these Gentlemen came to the House, and being called in, each of them had a Chair set, one on the Right and the other on the Left Hand of the Prolocutor, and being asked several Questions, they were pleased to resolve them agreeably to the Sense of the Majority of the Lower House, and afterwards to put their Resolutions in Writing signed with the Names of each of them, to remain on the Lower House Books for the Benefit of all future Convocations.

They did it without the Knowledge of Bishops or Clergy of Ireland.

In this manner it was that this Paper was said to be obtained, and in the Account of which these two Things are most Remarkable; First, That there were four Bishops of the Church and Convocation of Ireland then in Town (one whereof was His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Dublin) and not one of them either consulted or acquainted with the Design of these two Gentlemen to bring the Convocation of Ireland into any share of the Dispute between the two Houses here; which Slight and Disrespect their Lordships have on many Occasions resented in Ireland.

The other Previous Remark is, That these two Undertaking Gentlemen had never asked the Leave, or solicited for the Consent of their own House, or any Member of it, or desired the Advice or Opinion of any one of their own Body, before they made this Representation and delivered their Paper into the Lower House here; so that it has no other Support, nor can lay claim to any other Authority, but what the Zeal and Forwardness of these two Gentlemen gives it; for as to what is alledged in Defence of it, as done by the whole House afterwards, I shall shew it to have very little weight with any Man who will consider it indifferently.

The

The first Paragraph of that Paper runs thus (viz) The Members of the Lower House of this present Convocation were Summoned, Elected, and Returned, by Virtue of the Præmunientes Clause in the Bishops Parliamentary Writs, which Clause was Executed by all the Bishops throughout the Kingdom: But the Clergy deferred the Electing of a Prolocutor, and the proceeding to Business until the Reception of the Provincial Writs by the several Archbishops:

As to the Members being Summoned by the Præmunientes Clause; 'tis certainly true, and they were Elected and Returned accordingly: But the other part of this Paragraph is the most Insincere partial Account that can be given: They only say that the Clergy deferred chusing a Prolocutor and proceeding to Business; as if they thought that they had full Power to do both (if they pleased) before the Provincial Writ came. The true Matter of Fact was thus. Upon the Execution of the Præmunientes Clause, many of the Clergy thought themselves obliged to Obey it, and a considerable Number of them came to Dublin, and having an intimation from his Grace the Lord Archbishop of Dublin to meet in St. Patrick's Church after Evening Prayer, they accordingly met in the Chapter House and made a very numerous Assembly. His Grace of Dublin took the Dean's Chair, and having told the Clergy the Occasion of his desiring them to Meet, and their incapacity to Sit as a Convocation without the Provincial Writs, He advised them then and there to Consult and Debate what was fit to be done in order to obtain the Provincial Writs. After many Speeches and a long time spent in Arguing, it seemed to be the unanimous Sense of all the Clergy then met, that (whatever Parliamentary Rights or Capacity they might have by Virtue of the Præmunientes Clause) yet they neither were nor could be an Ecclesiastical Body, nor Meet as such in Synod, without the Provincial Writs.

It was then and still is a laudable Custom of the Clergy of the City and Suburbs of Dublin, to Meet once a Week in the Vestries of some of their Churches, to confer together, to consult and consider what may tend to the Honour of Religion, and the Spiritual Improvement and Advantage of their respective Flocks: and in these Assemblies there is one Chosen for a certain time to preside and moderate in their Debates: Now to prevent any Umbrage or Offence,

Offence, that might be taken at such a Concourse of the Clergy, as attended then in Dublin by the *Præmunientes* Clause, and who owned themselves to have no legal Right or Power to Form a Synod, they agreed to mix themselves in those Meetings of the Dublin-Clergy to concert proper Measures for obtaining the Provincial Writs: and at the same time they judged that no further Notice would be taken, since they met in those Places and Assemblies, which had been ordinarily used before. But most of the Clergy who came from distant Places, grew weary of a fruitless Attendance, and returned Home; as many as staid, came pretty constantly to these Assemblies, and drew up several Addresses to the Lords Archbishops and Bishops, praying their Lordships Favour, Interest and Application to obtain those Writs, which after a tedious Expectation of about six Weeks, were at length Ordered to Issue. All this appears from the Books of the Lower House, and from hence you may guess what Opinion the Lower Clergy of Ireland had of the *Præmunientes* Clause, and whether they only deferred the Choice of a Prolocutor, and falling to Business, or that they thought they were not Qualified, nor could be Safe, nay, that they were no Ecclesiastical Body, without the Provincial Writ.

The Provincial Writs were never Executed.

What follows the first Paragraph is truly stated, till we come to that which begins thus: The Returns of all Members were made to the several Archbishops, and a List of the Members of the Lower House was transmitted to the Lower House from the Upper. This Account being a little intricate and perplexed, will need an Explanation, and it seems they contrived to cover a wrong Step, in which perhaps both Houses were over-seen: For upon the Reception of the Provincial Writs, instead of going to an Election upon these Writs, which were never yet duly Executed, there was a sort of an Agreement or Order made, that the Members Chosen by the Clause (*Præmunientes*) should be Taken and Esteemed to all intents and purposes, for Members Elected and Returnable by the Provincial Writs. I cannot particularly recollect the Words or Manner in which this was done; but sure I am that there was no New Election, and consequently no Execution at all of the Provincial Writs: tho' the Clergy were so sensible immediately before, that they could be no Synod without them: And what difference there is between no Writ and a Writ not Executed, as to any Power given, I cannot comprehend; but

but the Truth is, the Clergy were such utter Strangers to Convocation Matters, that 'tis not so much to be wondered, that they Erred in some few things, as that they did not Err in many more.

The Design therefore of that Account seems to be this, That the Returns formerly said to be made upon the Præmunientes Clause, which neither were, nor could be made to the Archbishops, were then to be looked upon as the Returns made to the Provincial Writs; and then a List of the Lower House was sent down to them from the Upper.

And now to return to the Account of choosing the Prolocutor in the manner mentioned in that Paper, which I have allowed to be truly represented. But how far it is an allowed Right of the Lower House, to proceed in that manner, will be evident from what past in that very House the last Tear, upon choosing a Vice-Prolocutor. A long Indisposition had obliged the Prolocutor to think of retiring, and he came to the House and acquainted them, that he was no longer able to serve them, and therefore desired them to think of a proper Person to take the Chair, which he was then about to leave. The House Complimented him with the Nomination, and he Names the Dean of St. Patrick's, and the whole House unanimously agrees to it; whereupon the Prolocutor with the House go up to acquaint the Lords, that he was not able to discharge his Duty any longer, and that the House had unanimously chosen the Dean of St. Patrick's to supply his place during his Disability; and having delivered this Message he went strait to his Coach, and left the House Sitting with the Vice-Prolocutor in the Chair. Immediately after, the Lords sent for the Lower House, and told them that they had Acted too forwardly in pretending to choose a Vice-Prolocutor, without first asking Leave of them to proceed to that Election, that their Lordships utterly disallowed the Election, and would approve none, nor hold any Correspondence with them, till they prayed the Leave of the Upper House to Elect, and when they had so done, then to present him to the Lords for their Approbation. However displeasing this was to some of the House, they went strait to the Lords to beg Leave to Elect a Vice Prolocutor, which was granted them, and they proceeded to a second Election of the same Worthy Person, and he was presented to the Lords by

Their Method
of Choosing a
Prolocutor,
not an allowed
Right.

two of the Members of the Lower House, and approved by their Lordships in their own House, which Approbation was intimated to the House when he took the Chair. This Instance shews undeniably how far the Lords do allow of what the Lower House did in the manner of choosing a Prolocutor, and what weight there is in that part of the Representation: Besides that the Upper House Book of the Convocation of 1661. plainly shews, that the Method used by the present Lower House in choosing a Prolocutor, was quite different in several Circumstances from that which they made use of at that time, when these things were much better understood.

Appointment
of Commit-
tees.

The next Point in the Paper, is that of the Lower House appointing Committees, particularly that of Elections; and 'tis certain they appointed four or five standing Committees, besides many Occasional ones: But I never heard that they pretended to do this by Precedents of their own, but they took them either from the Practice of the House of Commons, or from the Claim of the Lower House then Sitting in England, or from the Speculative Arguments drawn from the nature of a separate House; for from these three Originals chiefly, all or most of the Usages and Rights of the Lower House in Ireland sprung.

Punishment
of Members
for Absence,
not rightly
stated.

The three following Paragraphs relate to the Call of the House, and the giving Leave to Members to be Absent, or Punishing them for not Attending, in which some things are not so fairly stated as they ought to be: For the Paper calls those Members Contumaciously Absent, who Neglected to appear upon a Summons from the Lower House; whereas all that ever the Lower House pretended to in that Matter, was to accuse of Contumacy in the Upper House. The Usage in short was thus; Upon a Call of the House, if a Member neither Appear'd nor sent a reasonable Excuse, the Prolocutor was ordered to carry up the Names of all such Persons to the Lords, and to pray that their Lordships would declare them Contumacious, and proceed accordingly against them if they did not Attend: But no Man was ever declared or pronounced Contumacious in the Lower House. And as for Leave to be Absent, it was first propos'd, and granted in the Lower House, and the Prolocutor still ordered to carry up their Names to the Lords, and pray that they would confirm the Leave given to such Members to be Absent: and I am pretty well assured that there appears upon the present Upper House Books, leave of Absence given to several

veral Members of the Lower House, who never so much as acquainted their own House with it beforehand.

The Paragraph that begins thus (In case of a Vacancy) Pag. 28. represents that Affair justly enough, but I know not to what purpose.

The five following Paragraphs relate to the Adjournments of the Lower House and their holding Intermediate Sessions : Adjourn-
ments, and
Intermediate
Sessions. As to this last part, there can be no doubt but that they held Intermediate Sessions, and looked upon them as regular as the Con- current Sessions; but by what Precedent or upon what Authority I cannot tell; for as to that which is alleged of an Answer given to some Queries proposed by the Earl of Nottingham, however Artificially it is managed in that Paper, as if that Answer had been made by a full and competent Authority, yet you are to understand that this was transacted a long time before the Convocation Sat, and was only the Opinion of a few Bishops, not too well acquainted at that time with Convocation Rights, but very desirous to get Synods restored in Ireland. But as the Upper House Books take no notice of these Intermediate Sessions, which have been very frequent, so the Lords have never yet, by any Publick Act of their House, given or shewn their Approbation of them : One thing I am very sure of, that the warm Contending of the Majority of the Lower House in England for those Intermediate Sessions, was a principal Reason for the Lower Clergy's insisting on them in Ireland. Besides that it was a very favourable Juncture, to claim Rights and Privileges, when they began on a new Foundation, and had no Precedent against them.

The Matter of Adjournments is very strangely Represented Pag. 18. in that Paper; that the Actuary sometimes did it by word of Mouth, that the Forms are various, &c. A short Account will easily clear that whole Matter. The first four or five Days of the Convocation's Sitting, the Actuary of the Upper House read a Paper in the Lower House, to this effect, That his Grace the President with the rest of the Archbishops and Bishops, did Adjourn this whole Convocation to such a Time and Place. The Lower Clergy were not well pleased with the Words (whole Convocation) and it seems some of the Lords did not agree to the Word President; for after that time the Form was quite altered, and continues

the same ever since that Alteration in these words, viz. The Lords Archbishops and Bishops of the Upper House of Convocation, have Commanded me to intimate to you, that this Convocation is Adjourned, &c. and signed by the Actuary of the Upper House, read by him in the Lower, and so left upon the Table; and I am confident there has been no Variation from their Form since the first Week of their Sitting.

Intercourse
between the
Two Houses:

The three next Paragraphs, viz. That which begins (All Messages sent from the Lower House) and the two following, are fairly Represented; only as to the Third, it may be remembered, that on some Occasions, when some Members have been denied the liberty of Protesting, they have said Publickly in the Lower House that they would Protest in the Upper. As to the Papers offered by the Prolocutor to the Bishops, 'tis generally true that they have been received; and as true that their Lordships in more than a Twelve Months time, scarce gave an Answer to any Paper of Business: But after several importunate Addresses to their Lordships for Answer to the many Papers sent up, they return a short Answer to a great Number at once, and in one and the same Paper; and most of those Answers contained no more than a bare Affirmative or Negative on the Subject offered, and were so very short and imperfect, that many of them were Voted Unsatisfactory in the Lower House. 'Tis certain the Lower House had for the most part easie access to their Lordships, tho' sometimes they were obliged to attend long for it, and once at St. Andrew's Church were refused admittance after waiting some Hours in expectation of it.

And there was a time too, when the Lower House disdainig to receive their Lordships ordinary Messenger, which is the Kirger of the Upper House, sent him back to their Lordships with this Answer, That they would receive no more Messages by so mean an Officer: But their Lordships immediately sent to assure the House, that if they refused that Messenger, they should have no other, nor would they hold any further Correspondence at all with the Lower House. Upon this the Lower House abated of their Pretension, and notwithstanding the Resentment they expressed but just before, they made a Rule to receive the Virger as the Messenger of the Upper House with a Salvo Jure to their own, and then the Lords were

were pleased to pass by the Error and continue to transact with them.

The last Article in that Paper seems calculated on purpose to serve the turn of some Men, who are very industrious to represent their Superiors in the worst Colours they can ; but the Gentlemen ought to be thanked only for their good Will to serve their Friends in this, there being the least ground for such an Assertion of any one that they have advanced. To say that the Lords so ordered their Sessions, that Business has never been interrupted for want of Synodical Meetings, is so palpable a Mistake, that it is hard to think how it should be committed. For first it is undeniable, that the Upper House Sessions were not so frequent as the Lower, possibly not much more than half the number, if a right Computation were made ; and of those Upper House Sessions, I may reasonably compute that the fourth part had nothing transacted but the Adjournments ; which certainly will be allowed to be some interruption of Business ; and another fourth part may be very justly allowed to have been spent in adjusting of Forms and settling Addresses. There will remain therefore but one half of the Upper House Sessions to be employed in Business purely Synodical, which will amount to little more than one fourth of the Sessions of the Lower House, and by this it is easy to judge whether Business was never interrupted for want of Synodical Meetings.

Ordering of
Sessions in
Ireland.

But that which will demonstrate the Insincerity of this Assertion is, that more than two Thirds of the Clergy, who came up to Convocation, grew tired of attending in Town, as seeing not the least hopes of any Business to be done, and therefore return'd home again. They observed, that of the many Papers sent up to the Lords, they were pleased to take so little notice, that sometimes they never heard more of them in many Months, or possibly not at all : And upon considering the Conduct of the Upper House in this Particular, it was at last the Opinion of almost the whole Lower Clergy, that their Lordships saw some good Reasons, why it was not seasonable to proceed to Business at this time, and therefore did not much importune them about it : And this Opinion of the Lower Clergy was and is so deeply rooted, that their latter Meetings have not consisted of a quarter part of their Number, but been made up chiefly of

of the Members in and about Dublin, and such as happened to be there on other Occasions; the rest still excusing themselves for not attending, by reason there was no Prospect of any Business to be done.

And if Business were never interrupted for want of Synodical Meetings, certainly we should have heard of some Synodical Business done by the Convocation in more than four Years time; but I could never yet be informed of any Synodical Act done, except a Declaration which passed both Houses, and was printed by Order of Synod, to vindicate the Clergy from being disaffected to the Government and the Succession. And this indeed was a very seasonable necessary Act, and the only one that was done by the Synod.

Decent Behaviour of the Clergy of Ireland, to their Bishops.

But however indisposed the Lords seemed all along for the dispatch of Business, the Lower Clergy still preserved their Duty and Esteem for them, and never reproached their Lordships either publicly or privately, as Men designing any Injury to the Church, but were entirely satisfied, that in due time, and at a proper juncture, their Lordships would exert themselves in every thing, which might prove they were truly zealous for the Church. And since by the good Providence of God, and under the Government of the best of Queens, who is equally the Ornament and the Defender of the Church, both the Bishops and the Lower Clergy were fully convinced that the Established Religion was in no other Danger, than what it has ever been since it had an Establishment, and must be till it become Triumphant in Heaven; they seemed content on both sides to let things remain as they are, and not disturb the Government by too fierce and eager an Application for some new Constitutions, which in time they doubted not would be granted, if the too warm temper of some Men did not prove the Obstacle.

It was to this good Disposition of the Clergy in general, and to the Deference and Duty which the Lower Clergy shewed to their Superiors, and to the mutual Trust and Confidence which they always had in each other, that they owe that perfect Unity and Harmony which is between the two Houses; and not at all to the Bishops allowing all the Rights and Privileges as represented in that Paper, nor yet to the concurring with the Clergy on all occasions in doing and promoting of Business, which is
very

very plain they did not; however solemnly swear these two Gentlemen do bless God for it in that Paper.

Thus, Sir, I have freely imparted my Thoughts of that Paper, which the Author of the Pamphlet says, contains an irresistible Proof, that the Pretensions of the English Lower House were just and well founded: If it is such a Proof, it must be so with those, who know little or nothing of the Irish Transactions.

But the Author, to add further Weight and Strength to this Testimony, tells us, that a Complaint was made in the Lower House in 1707. of the Account given by the two Members in England, and that, upon a full hearing in a numerous House, it was resolved, Paragraph by Paragraph, to be a just and true Representation of the Proceedings of that House. A brief Narrative of this Matter will let you see clearly, how much weight it adds to that Paper.

A Complaint indeed was made, not against that Representation, or the Matters contained in it; for those were then utterly unknown to the Complainer, as he publicly professed in the House: But the Subject of the Complaint was, that any particular Member of the House should take upon him to relate and represent the Proceedings of that House, without the Knowledge or Consent or Authority of the House, and this to a publick Body of Men, in a solemn and formal Manner, and sign the same as Members of the House, and to get their Representation so signed, entered on the Books of the Lower House to be made use of as they should think fit: This was complained of as an high Injury and Contempt, and as a Breach of the Privilege of that House whereof they were Members.

The Report of the two Members called in question by the Lower House, in Ireland.

Notice of this Complaint was immediately sent to Mr. Archdeacon Percivale, by Order of the House, the other Person concerned being then in England. When the Archdeacon appeared at the Committee, to which it was referred, he would neither own nor disown the Matter of the Complaint, but would put it upon the Member who complained to prove the Allegation; and thus it continued for some time, till the Person who complained, undertook to the House, that he would procure by a certain time

an Authentick Copy of that whole Affair, out of the Books of the Lower House in England : Then indeed the Arch-Deacon was advised by his Friends, and produced that Paper in the same words as it is now Printed, only that neither his nor the other Gentleman's Name was Subscribed to it.

The Committee being met to go through that Affair, the Member who Complained, was Voted into the Chair; by which it was immediately guessed what Disposition they were in; and at the same time they Voted to Examine the Paper, Paragraph by Paragraph, as to the Truth of each of them. Whereas it was urged by some others, that this was not the Matter before them, nor were they much concerned whether the Assertions of the Paper were true or false, but whether their Members for taking upon them to give such Accounts before so great an Assembly, had not incurred the Censure, and broke the Privilege of the House. However it was carried to Examine the Paper, and the Vote being put upon each Paragraph, it was carried to affirm the Truth of each : But when it came upon the Question, whether the Members by giving in this Representation to the Lower House in England, had not acted contrary to their Duty and to the Rights of the House; this admitted of more Debate, and in the End was carried in their Favour, and the Vote was to this effect, Whether Mr. A. D. P. and Mr. H. Members of that House, having in their Private Capacity given in that Representation to the Lower House in England, had acted contrary to the Rights of the House, or done any thing in derogation of the House; and passed in the Negative.

The Approba-
tion of their
Report pass'd
in a very thin
House.

The same Methods and Management, that carried these Votes in the Committee, did likewise prevail in the House, where they were Passed by a large Majority : But the House was so far from being Numerous, that I dare venture to affirm it did not consist of Thirty, and how great weight this Number can give to the Authority of that Paper, may be judged, when you know that the full Number makes about one Hundred and Fifty; and the Majority of those few who Voted, must be owned to be somewhat more than Well-wishers to the Majority of the Lower House here : Nay, it was moved by some to give Thanks to the Two Members for
the

the good Services done the Lower House by that Representation; but to do Justice to the Gentleman who appeared, it was dropt at his own request. And when the House was put in Mind of the Incongruity of those words, that they had acted in their Private Capacity, whereas it was certain they had both appeared and acted and signed in their Convocation Capacity, which is the only Publick Capacity they have, yet it was in vain to think of getting those inconsistent words razed or altered.

This is a faithful Account of the whole Matter of the Complaint, which I dare Appeal to any unbiassed Person, that had it been brought against any Member of either House of Parliament, in their own House; nay, had it been made even in the House where it was made against any particular Member going to do the same Service to the Upper House here, whether he had not suffered the severest Censure they could lay upon him.

I cannot omit informing you, that it was often urged both to the House and to the Committee, that this Action of the two Members, if not Censured, would infallibly draw in the Convocation of Ireland into the Dispute here, which for many Reasons they ought to avoid, but it was to no purpose to urge any thing against an Act so Meritorious. 'Tis now pretty plain, whether that was not their main Design in what they did.

But however Prosperous they were in the Lower House, I dare affirm to you that their good Success was not at all pleasing to most of the Upper House, who fore saw this Consequence; and once seemed resolved to bear the whole Matter in their Lordships House, had it not been too near the End of the Session. Several of my Lords the Bishops have expressed great Indignation, that the Lower House should so easily pass by, nay, and seem to approve one of the most inconsiderate rash Attempts, not only against the Rights of their own House, but against the whole Convocation, that ever was made. And their Lordships may yet find a time to Resent it, and to endeavour to heal the Breach it has made of the Rights of their House; for they will find on their own Books so little Countenance to such a Practice, that when the Lower House of 1661. had a Mind to send an Agent into England for some Affairs of the Church; they first ask'd Leave of their Lordships to send, and then pray their Approbation of the Person. How far this Instance will justify,

The Report
Resented by
Several of the
Bishops of
Ireland.

He these two Gentlemen, will need very little Application to
 shew. I beg Pardon for the unexpected Length of this Paper,
 and am S I R, &c.

I believe this Letter will satisfy the Reader, that the Pa-
 trons of the Lower House Claims in England, have no great
 Reason to value themselves upon this *Testimony* from Ireland:
 and that this Writer has much less Reason to dedicate this,
 among other Papers, to the *Most Reverend and Right Reue-*
rend, as well as the *Reverend the Members of the Convocation*
of that Kingdom. The Reader will also see, by this Account,
 with what Justice and Truth this Writer says in his Preface,
 that these Rights are enjoyed by the Clergy in Ireland, with
 the entire Approbation of their Ecclesiastical Superiours; and in his
 Book, that by means of the Bishops chiefly, as well as with their en-
 tire Approbation, the Lower Clergy have been put in Possession of
 these Rights; as well as with what Ingenuity it is attested by
 the two Members, and recognized by the Majority of a thin
 House in Ireland, that they enjoyed all these several Rights and
 Privileges, without the least Struggle, Contest or Difference, with
 their Graces and Lordships.

But I have other Observations to make, which will, I
 hope, further convince every Indifferent Man, that the
 Clergy of the Lower House here, can receive no Support
 from the present Practice of their Brethren in Ireland, and
 that what remains upon Record in the *Irish Convocation*, is
 directly against them.

Observations
 upon the Pra-
 ctice in Ire-
 land.

I am so far of this Writer's Opinion, as to think that the
Irish Convocation was formed, tho' not so entirely as he says,
 on the Model of that of *England*: But the Inference I should
 draw from that, is, that therefore the Form and Manner of
 holding Convocations in Ireland, should be regulated by
 what we find upon the Records of Convocation here; and
 not, as this Writer argues, the Form and Manner of hold-
 ing Convocations in *England*, by the present Practice of one
 House in Ireland, which is all that is produced to support
 the Lower House Claims. For there is not the least Refer-
 ence to any preceding Form or Practice of Convocation
 there, nor so much as to the Memory of one or two Ancient
 Mem-

Members, which we were formerly told of; though such a Testimony, under so much a longer Discontinuance of Convocations, than has been in *England*, could have been but of little Authority, without any Register to support it; much less if there was any Register remaining, that had many Things against it. And therefore I think it an astonishing piece of Confidence, and which hardly any other Writer could have assumed, to say that these *Customs and Usages in Ireland* must be looked upon as good Evidence of what belongs to us here, in such controverted Cases, as cannot now so perfectly be cleared by the few *Lower House Books*, that survived the great *Fire of London*. What! the Practice in *Ireland*, where there is but one Book of either House remaining, as far as yet appears, and that of the Upper, and that not referred to; and not above one Member in either House that was of the last Convocation before, which ended above 40 Years since; is this fit to clear a Controversie here, for want of Evidence at home, where we have *two entire Journals of the Lower House*, and more of the Upper, and a great many other *Extracts*, besides those in Dr. A's Hands, and several Members that have sat in both Houses in several Convocations? If this will pass with any Reader, this Author need not hereafter go so far for an Argument, but may, without more ado, dictate at home, and assert what he pleases.

I do believe, as I said, the Convocation of *Ireland* was formed on the Model of *England*, but it seems to be late before it came to that Form, or that there was any thing in *Ireland* answering to our Convocation here. I think there are several Reasons to believe there was no such Body in the 28th of *Henry VIII*, when several Acts passed vesting the Supremacy in him. For besides that there is no Mention of any in the Historians that have come to my Hands; the Clergy were Taxed in common with the other Subjects, by Act of Parliament only, and this continued till the beginning of *King Charles I*.

*An Account
of Convoca-
tions in Ire-
land.*

The Act of the 28th of *Henry VIII*, against Proctors to be Members of the Parliament, which ascribes the attempting of it to their ambitious Minds and Presumption, inordinately desiring to have Authority, and to intermeddle with every Cause

Cap. 12.

or Matter, without any just Ground, &c. does in the Preamble set forth, that at every Parliament begun and holden within this Land, two Proctors of every Diocese within the same Land, have been used and accustomed to be summoned and warned to be at the same Parliament, which were never by Order of the Law, Usage, Custom or otherwise, any Member or Parcel of the whole Body of the Parliament, nor have had of Right, any Voice or Suffrage in the same, but only be there as Counsellors and Assistants to the same; and upon such things of Learning as should happen in Controversie; to declare their Opinions, much like as the Convocation within the Realm of England, is commonly at every Parliament begun and holden by the King's Highness Special License, &c.

This Allusion which the Act makes to the Convocation of England, though not exact in it self, as it does not pretend to be, is yet I think another plain Intimation, that there was no such Body of the Clergy as a Convocation in Ireland: For had there been any such Legal Body of the Clergy in the then Constitution of Ireland, it would most probably have appeared in this Attempt of the Clergy, as it did in a somewhat-like Attempt made here in the Reign of Edward VI, 1547. Whereas the Act takes Notice, not of all such as were then called by the *Pramunientes* here, but only of two Proctors out of every Diocese: And it would most probably have referred them, not to England, but to their own Convocation, had there been any such Assembly, for the Delivery of their Opinions there, as often as there should be Occasion to consult them; especially had the Case been there, as this Writer would have it to be here, that the same Persons had been called, both by the Provincial and Parliamentary Writs.

Cox History,
288.

Edward VI, in the 5th Year of his Reign, sent an Order, for the Liturgy of the Church of England to be read in Ireland; and upon receiving that Order, Sir Anthony St. Leger his Vice-Roy, before he issued Proclamations for the Observance of it, called an Assembly of the Archbishop and Bishops, with other of the then Clergy of Ireland, to propose this Matter to them: But this was not yet any Legal Convocation, nor so reputed.

The Parliament of Ireland, 2d Eliz. passed the Act of Uniformity, and was soon dissolved, without any thing being done by the Clergy. The next Year, when there was no

Parliament, her Majesty signifies her Pleasure to the E. of *Suffex*, her Lord Lieutenant, for a general meeting of the Clergy of Ireland, and the establishment of the Protestant Religion, &c. but neither was this any legal Convocation, nor do we find any thing done by it; great Opposition being made in it by the Bishop of *Meath*, and the Assembly soon after dispersing themselves.

*Annals of
Ireland P. 3.*

We have no more of any Assemblies of the Clergy during this Reign, tho' there were more Parliaments before the end of it; and indeed we cannot expect that the Constitution of the Protestant Church there could be yet perfectly settled, while the State was so far from being so, as Sir *John Davies* has shewn: who observes that *King James I.* was the first Prince that ever put Bishops into the Sees, *Derry, Rapho and Clogher*, and that he did more in the first nine Years of his Reign towards the bringing Ireland entirely under the Obedience of the Crown of *England*, than had been done by his Predecessors in 440 Years. And yet these nine years do hardly reach to his first Parliament there, where there had not been one for 27 Years before. This Parliament met May 18. 1613; but we do not yet find any thing like a Convocation, in this or the following Year, at least not till the latter part of that Year; the *Gesta Hibernorum* seeming to put it at the end of 1614. whereas other Historians put it in 1615. according to the Title of the Articles then agreed on.

Page 56.

*Gest. Hiber.
P. 176.*

This is the first Convocation that as yet appears to have been in Ireland, of which one could at all say that it was formed on the Model of that of *England*: and yet this did not open with the Parliament, nor do we find any Subsidies granted by it, nor are the Articles agreed on in it, signed as in *England* by all the Members, but as Dr. *Parr* informs us, by Archbishop *Jones*, whom he calls Speaker of the House of Bishops in Convocation, as also by the Prolocutor of the House of the Clergy in their Names. This *Jones* was Lord Chancellour of Ireland at that time, and Archbishop of *Dublin*, to which See the Primacy of all Ireland was indeed transferred from that of *Armagh*, in the 5th of *Ed. VI.* upon the Opposition which Archbishop *Dowdall* made to the King's Order above-mentioned; but it was restored by Queen *Mary*, and never after revoked, tho' some

*1 Convoc. in
Ireland 1615.*

*Bp. Ushers
Life P. 14.*

Some Contests for Precedency continued between the Archbishops of those Sees. And the Archbishop of *Dublin's* being then, as Lord Chancellor, Speaker of the House of Lords in Parliament, might occasion his having the same Office and Title in the House of Bishops in Convocation: tho' there was an Archbishop of *Armagh* at that time Privy Counsellour and Lord Almoner to the King.

As this is the first Convocation we meet with in *Ireland*; so by the short Accounts we have of it, it seems not to have been perfectly settled in point of *Form*, nor in the Business of such Assemblies at that time in *England*; the Clergy not being yet arrived at taxing themselves, nor can I hear that any thing of it remains besides the *Articles* above-mentioned.

We hear no more of Convocations or Parliaments, till the 10th of *Car. I.* 1634. and then indeed the Convocation opens more after the manner of *England*. It met about the time of the Parliament, and the Precedency between the Archbishops of *Armagh* and *Dublin* being formally determined by the King in favour of the former just before their Assembling, the Archbishop of *Armagh* presided, and signed the Synodical Acts, and the Clergy now for the first time, as far as appears, gave eight Subsidies to the King; and the Grant signed by Archbishop *Usher* is enacted by Authority of Parliament, in which Grant the Prelates and Clergy are said to be called together out of the several *Provinces* by Authority of the King's Writ. If this is not a mistake in the Print, the whole National Synod of four *Provinces* seems to have been called together by one Writ, which is different not only from our Practice here, but from the present established Practice in *Ireland*.

In this Convocation the *Articles of the Church of England* were received, and a *Book of new Canons* made; but nothing of the Acts or Proceedings of either House of this Convocation remain on Record, so that hitherto we have no Light from the Kingdom of *Ireland*.

In 1639 a Parliament meets again, and a Convocation I suppose about this time, because I find a Subsidy granted by the Prelates and Clergy, tho' the exact time of granting it does not clearly appear; but it was probably in that short

Stay

Parrs Life of
Archbishop
Usher, P. 41.

Clergy in Ire-
land begin to
tax them-
selves, 1634

Stay that the *B. of Strafford* made there, from *Mar. 18.* to *Apr. 3.* in which time the Parliament gave theirs; because *Archbishop Usber* came into *England* at the beginning of 1640. I have met with nothing to the contrary, but a Note in the *Parliamentary Original, and Rights of the Lower House*, which Page 15. intimates this Convocation to be held 1640. But if it began in that Year, as the Date of Convocations should be the Year in which they begin; then this Convocation did not begin with the Parliament, and so was not exactly agreeable to that which this Writer pretends is the Model of ours.

But he may possibly be able to clear up this doubt, by his Interest in the Author of the Book now referred to, who pretends to have, or to have seen at least, the Acts of the Upper House of this Convocation; and 'tis to be hoped they furnish him with his Citation, because the other Acts of 1661, to which he also refers, do not give it us as he there presents it, at least, according to the Copy of those last Acts which I have perused.

If these Acts of 1640. are among the *Extracts* which *Dr. A.* keeps to himself, the Author of the *Parliamentary Rights* would do well to procure them, and let the World see that these Words *similiter etiam*, which I shall speak more of presently, are to be found in them at least, tho' according to his Reference they ought to be found in them both.

We are now come to the Convocation of 1661, of which Observations we have the Upper House Book continued to *Mar. 29. 1666.* from the Upper House Book in Ireland, 1661. And this Convocation met indeed within two Days of the Parliament, tho' not in Virtue of the *Premunientes Clause* (as this Writer would fain have Convocations meet) but, as the *King's Commission and License to treat, communicate, consult about, and conclude upon certain Articles and Canons*, expresses it, *per seperat. Brevia nostra ad prefatum Reverendissimum Armachanum Archiepiscopum totiusq; Hibernia Primatem, ceterosq; Reverendissimos Archiepiscopos respectivè & sigillatim emissâ.*

With what Face then can this Writer in his Dedication to the *Most Reverend, &c.* speak of the Restoration of their *Legal Synods, sitting equal by the Parliamentary and Provincial Writs*; when the King, whose Writs they all are, takes notice of them as sitting by the Provincial only? It is not true
of.

of this last *supposed Convocation of Ireland*, which, as far as appears, sat by the *Parliamentary only*, and consequently were no Convocation, properly so called. For there is no Appearance that the Provincial Writs were executed at all: which makes a little for the Truth of what Mr. Percivale and Mr. Higgins deliver, that the *Members of the Lower House of this present Convocation in Ireland*, were summoned, elected, and returned, by virtue of the *Pramunientes Clause*, but not at all for the justness of that Assertion, or for the use that is made of it; the Convocation of *Ireland* depending of right, as has been shewn, upon the Provincial Writs.

If the *Pramunientes Clause* makes the Clergy, who are summoned, elected, and returned upon it, any thing, it makes them Members of, or Attendants on Parliament, to which only it calls them: And yet we see by the Statute above-cited, that it gave them no Interest there. Indeed, the Clergy of the Lower House, in strength I suppose of their *Pramunientes*, seemed at the beginning of the Parliament in *Ireland* to think that they had an Interest, when they presented this *Memorial to the Speaker*.

Mar. 1704.

But their desiring to withdraw it immediately afterward, shews, that the Clergy, how briskly soever they set out upon their *Pramunientes*, soon grew to distrust the only Powers they seem to have had: And it would be very strange then, if that Clause should give them any Place or Interest in such an Assembly as the Convocation, to which it does not require them to come, and of which it takes not the least kind of notice, and which is summoned by a different Writ; being in this as agreeable to ours, as a Synod of four Provinces can be to a Synod of one.

The manner of
opening the
Convoc. in
Ireland, 1661.

But then the manner of opening this Convocation is different from ours, and more to the Advantage, if possible, of the Archbishops and Bishops, than it is amongst us. For on the Day of the opening, the first thing they do, while they are yet by themselves, is decreeing and pronouncing *Hanc Synodum inceptam & inchoatam esse, & ita reputandam fore*; then they chuse their Register and Virger, before they send for the Inferior Clergy, who are supposed to be attending in the usual Place of their Sitting; whereas on the first

first Day of the Convocation here, in that Year, and in 1640, the Clergy are described as at the very opening of it.

This, which is really to the Advantage of the Clergy, as representing them more a necessary part of the Convocation, the Author of the *Parliamentary Rights* does not like, as seeming to be against that Separateness of the Lower House which he contends for; and therefore he will have this Attendance to be *Voluntary, and not Regular*; and to support that Opinion, leaves the known Registers of the Convocation in *England*, and has recourse to two Upper House Books of *Ireland* for these two Convocations; tho' we know but of one, and that he has not fairly transcribed. In his Note it is thus, *Et deinde omnes & singulos Decanos, Archidiaconos, Capitulorumq; & Cleri Procuratores in inferiori Domo Convocationis, similiter etiam virtute Brevium Regiorum ea ex parte congregatos, coram eisdem convocari fecerunt.* The Words *similiter etiam*, which are very significant in the use he makes of this Passage, are not in the Copy of that Upper House Book which is in my Hands. But there is another Passage in the very next Page, of which he can hardly be ignorant, that shews another sort of Attendance of the Clergy there, upon the Archbishops and Bishops, than is paid here in *England*.

*Parl. Rights,
&c. p. 15.*

I must observe to the Reader, that whereas the Sermon precedes the opening of the Convocation here, it is not till the Day of the next Session in *Ireland* by this Upper House Book; and on that Day the Clergy walk on foot two and two before the Bishops, who ride on Horseback from Trinity Church in Dublin, to that of St. Patrick in the Suburbs: And then I believe he will wonder, that any Man who knew how this Convocation was opened without the Clergy on the first Day, and how they attended the second, should refer to this Book, for the support of that Independance of the Lower House upon the Upper which is struggled for here.

The Attendance of the Clergy in Ireland.

But this Book will furnish many more such occasions of Wonder before we have done. For on the first Day, when the Archbishops and Bishops had commanded the Clergy to choose a Prolocutor, and present him to them before they rose;

as they immediately did, which is different from our Practice here, and leaves less room for putting him in the Chair before Confirmation; they gave them leave to chuse their own Register and Actuary, *cateraq; quæ ad constitutionem Domus sua spectant & pertinent, faciendi & peragendi*: And this Actuary so chosen, is nominated to the Upper House by the Prolocutor, after his own Confirmation, and approved by them.

The Bishops gave the Lower House leave to choose an Actuary.

Account, p. 30.

How then could the two Gentlemen of *Ireland* give in the Choice of their own Actuary, as one of the Rights and Usages of the Lower House there, and tell us particularly it was made before the Confirmation of the Prolocutor? And how could this Writer, who has probably seen this Upper House Book, which the Author of the *Parliamentary Rights* refers to as above, tell the World, that this Paper of these two Gentlemen contains an irresistible Proof, that the Pretensions of the English Lower House (one of which is the Right of choosing their own Actuary) were just and well founded.

This Assertion is the more surprizing, because there was much more room to expect, that there might be this Power of choosing, in a Synod of four Provinces, where (tho' one presided yet) no one had Jurisdiction over the whole, nor consequently any Officer under him, that extended to all the Parts of it. And accordingly we find the Archbishops and Bishops choosing their Register; which might give more colour to the Lower House choosing theirs, than can be found here, where there is no Choice in the Upper, but the Archbishop's Register officiates of course, as Register of the whole Convocation.

For which reason, if the Lower House in *Ireland*, under their more favourable Circumstances, did not proceed to any Choice of their Actuary, till they were first Licensed by the Bishops to do it; much less is there any pretence for it here, and least of all, any ground to support that Pretence from the Rights and Usages of the Lower House of Convocation in *Ireland*.

The Lower House in *Ireland* being, in the Method above-mentioend, provided of a Prolocutor and Actuary, our next

En-

Enquiry naturally is, what they did in point of what these Gentlemen call *their Adjournments*.

Having no Books of the Lower House there, we must see what we can learn from the Upper: And here I find, ^{Concerning the pretended Adjournments in Ireland.} that on the first Day of the Convocation, when the Upper House had confirmed all the Choices made in the Lower; considering that many of the Clergy were not yet come to Town, and that there was much Business depending in Parliament, *Statuerunt & Decreverunt ipsam abhinc prorogand. fore usq; ad vicesimum primum instantis Maii, quam ad statim ita prorogârunt.* The Prorogation of the next Session, is entered thus. After the Upper House had required the Clergy to signify their Election of Afternoon Preachers in *proximam Sessionem*; *Decretum denique fuit & Statutum, proximam futuram Sessionem tenendam fore, vicesimo quinto, &c.* These Entries, with several others of like form, which occur in this Book, do I think shew as plainly as can be expected in an Upper House Book, both that the whole Convocation was prorogued then, without any Regard to, or Supposition of the Consent of the Clergy to such Prorogations; and that there was no such Practice then known, as holding intermediate Sessions.

There is one only Entry in this Book, that gives the least colour to think there ever was such a Session, and that I shall freely produce, tho' I have not yet found it alledged in this Cause; It is upon *August 29, 1662.* The Convocation had been prorogued from the 5th of that Month to the 19th; and on that Day, the Prolocutor, in the Name of the Lower House, offered to the Upper several Votes and Results of that House, relating to the State of the Clergy; at the Head of which Votes, I find, as transcrib'd in this Copy, *Acta die septimo Augusti, 1662.* ^{Concerning Intermediate Sessions.}

Whether this was an unheeded Mistake in the first Instance by the Lower House Actuary; or in the second, by the Actuary of the Upper; or in the third, by this Copy, any of which might very well be, or whether it was any, I shall not undertake to determine: Let the Reader judge but candidly of it, and consider whether it is probable, from such a single Appearance, that the Lower House sat on

the 7th, as a House, in the Interval of the Prorogation made in the Upper; when the general Form and Manner of the Prorogations by the Archbishops and Bishops runs so, as to make one believe they did not; and when many other Passages in this Convocation carry the Authority of the Upper House further than is pretended in *England*.

Synodical Acts
by the Bishops
only.

Those Synodical Acts in which the Clergy have the greatest Concurrence, are said to be *ex Autoritate Patrum, &c. cum consensu sive ad Petitionem Cleri*, in the last of which Forms the Liturgy of the *Church of England* was received there. But in some, the Archbishops and Bishops, as far as appears, acted alone in the Name of the Synod, as in the Instrument of Thanks to the *Bishop of Cork*, Sept. 10, 1661. and in that of Congratulation to the *D. of Ormond*, Mar. 4. to both which the Primate put his Seal in Synod, and in the Name of it. In like manner they gave to the *D. of Ormond* a *Subsidy*, to be raised upon every Ecclesiastical Benefice, without any mention of the Clergy's being consulted about it, as they are in the Subsidies to the King, which they granted *June 15, 1661. sub modo & tempore, ipsis Reverendissimis & Reverendis Patribus statuend.* As they left themselves entirely to be taxed by the Bishops, *July 20*, for the Expences of the Delegates that were to be sent into *England*; having first named the Persons they chose, to the Bishops, to be confirmed by them. *Mar. 24*, they command the Prolocutor, and the rest that came with him, to propose some Remedy for the Moderation of Fees to be hereafter demanded by the Deans and Chapters throughout *Ireland*, for the Confirmation of Episcopal Acts. *Apr. 24. 1662*, they put the Lower House in mind of it again, and were told in way of Answer and Excuse, that the Clergy were not unmindful of it, but that as soon as the Members came up, whom they expected very quickly, they would consider of it without delay, and do what should be agreeable to Equity, and testify their Regard to that House. *May 28*, they refer themselves to the Ancient Customs, and the Transgressors of them to proper Punishment, and offer the correcting those Customs, if they be found exorbitant.

Upon

Upon this the Bishops at the next Session, *Jan. 3*, order'd that all the Registers of Deans and Chapters throughout *Ireland* should be admonished, under Pain of Suspension, to bring in Tables of the Fees they demanded for the Dispatch of any Business. They do also the same Day order Letters to be sent to the Archbishop of *Cassel*, sealed with the Seal of the Synod, requiring him by the Authority of that House, to let *George Cook*, or some body for him, ask Alms in all the Churches of his Province; and that all Ministers, by the Authority of these Letters, should stir up the People to contribute liberally to him.

When the Lower House made an humble Address to the Upper, *July 1*, 1661, consisting of six Articles, in which several Matters were proposed for the better State of the Church, the President, in the Name of the rest, told the Clergy they were then too busie about other Matters, to consider what they proposed, as the Weight of them required; and that they had among themselves begun to think of some of those Things, which they hoped to bring to good Effect, and that the rest should be considered the next Session; but we hear no more of it, nor any Complaint of the Lower House for its being neglected.

Above a Year after indeed, *Aug. 19*, 1662, as I observed upon a former Occasion, they propose several Things, without any Reflection upon, or Regard to their first Address. These the Bishops consider the next Session; to some they agree as they are proposed, in some they make Alterations, and to some they demur. And the Archbishop and Bishops in *England* did as much as this, in answer to the Representation of the Lower House here, as I shewed before, considering that they had no Authority to make any new Constitutions.

Thomas Wilkinson Clerk, is Articled against in the Upper House, *July 24*, 1661, in the Name of the House, and proceeded against accordingly, the Clergy not appearing to have the least Share of the Process; as they have not in the Synodical Absolution of *Dr. Ledsham*, from the Sentence of his Ordinary, *Nov. 7*, 1665.

Sept.

And make several Orders.

Sept. 7, 1662, the Archbishops and Bishops by themselves ordain, that all Clergy-men should try such Causes as arose among themselves, before their respective Archbishops and Bishops.

Feb. 5, they make several Orders about the Habits and Equipage of the Bishops, for the more Distinction between them and Inferiour Orders; and on the same Day appoint a Form of Prayer to be used before all Preachers before their Sermons.

A new Commission upon the Death of the President.

There are several other Observations to be made from this Book, to the Advantage of the Upper House; and I am not aware of any thing but that single Instance I mentioned, that looks in the least to the Prejudice of it. I shall only add, that when Archbishop Bramhall died, and a new Primate succeeded, a new Commission from the King to enable the Convocation to proceed in their Business under their new President, was thought necessary, and accordingly sent.

And I dare appeal now to any Man of tolerable Candour, whether a Representation of the Practice of the present Members of the Lower House in *Ireland*, all entire Strangers to Convocation there, drawn up and approved in the manner we have seen, is an irresistible Proof, or even any Proof at all, of the Rights and Usages of that Body, which is supposed to have taken its Beginning and Form in great measure from ours; against, not only the Testimony of our *Registers* here, but even that single *Convocation-Book* that remains among them.

A Convocation consisting of four Provinces, must differ in many things from that of one, for all that this Writer has said to the contrary: But we have little Occasion to make use of this Difference; the Power of the President there appearing by this Book, where he always prorogues by himself, or by his Commission, to be as full, if not fuller, than is desired in *England*.

And had this Book been followed by the present Upper House in *Ireland*, who had no other Rule to go by; there had not been so great a Mistake there, as was made upon receiving a Royal Writ for Prorogation, when each Archbishop stood up and prorogued his own particular Synod:

And

And one may, upon the Authority of this Book, presume, that the Archbishop of *Tuam*, whose Name has been used to support the present Pretences, did not remember this to have been the Practice in 1661.

Notwithstanding all this, the Publisher of these Papers Page 32 will have *this Evidence from Ireland to be decisive*, and to be *a Milstone about the Neck of that Cause*, meaning the Cause of the Archbishop and Bishops, *which has hitherto been supported by Interest and Power, against clear Right and Reason*. How far he can see into this *Milstone* I know not; but I believe that every Body else will soon see that it must *fall upon his own Pate*, and that it cannot weigh down any Impartial Man to be of his Opinion.

I know not what Opinion he may have of Mr. *Higgins*, one of his Witnesses, nor what Returns he might make him for this Service, by other good Offices, in assisting his Work of Scandal, and inflaming things here: but I believe the Character of that Gentleman will not go far with any one that is serious, either in *England* or *Ireland*. And whoever considers the constant Correspondence that was held between Archdeacon *Percivale* in *Ireland*, and one, at least, of the Members of the Lower House here, who was of the same great College in *Oxford*, where this Account of the *Irish* Convocations was shewn, as I have it from one who saw it himself, some time before it was produced in the House; will have cause to suspect, that there was too great a concerting of Things in this Matter, to let the Paper given in by those Members, have the Force of a clear and impartial Evidence of what was *Right and Usage* in *Ireland*. And whoever observes that the Representation they make, is worded, as it were, on purpose to support the Pretensions here, and particularly to favour Dr. *A's* groundless Notion and Aim of having the *Præmunientes* and *Provincial* Members the same, by a fraudulent blending them together; will hardly be able to help thinking that his Art was employed, not only in procuring this Modern Practice to be used in *Ireland*, but also in drawing up this Evidence of it, and making these fine Enlargements upon it.

But

Ibid.

But be that as it will, this Writer tells us here *the Seed is sown*, and if he means that of Division, he knows he speaks true; and what *Harvest* he promises himself from that, and what is the *Illness of the Season* that retards it, he also is best able to tell; but as to Truth in the Conduct of the Cause, he has the least Pretence to it of any Man that ever I met with; as just a Commendation as he has given us of it, out of *Polybius*.

It is much more applicable to him and his Friends, what I meet with in the eleventh Book of that excellent Author; and if he will allow me the Liberty he has taken in a like Case, to put the Church for the State, and the Archbishop in *Scipio's* place, I will transcribe it for him, and translate it for other Readers.

It is an Oration of *Scipio's* to some of the *Roman* Soldiers that had revolted, and were in Mutiny against him.

Ἐσθ' ὃ δαυμάζειν τινι δυσαρρήσαν-
τες, ἢ ποίας ἐλπίσιν ἐπαρθέητες, ἐπεδ-
λοῖτο ποιεῖν. τρεῖς γὰρ αἰτίας
εἶναι, δι' αἷς πολλοὶ σασίαν ἀνθρώποι
περὶ παλαιοῦ καὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας ὅταν πε-
ρὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος τι καὶ δυσχεραίνουσιν. ἢ
τοῖς ἀποκρίνοισι πρὸς τὰς δυσαρρήσαν-
τας καὶ τὴν διὰ μετ' ὅρων ὀρεχθῶσι καὶ καλλί-
ων ἐλπίδων. Ἐρωτῶ ὃ τί τῶν ὑμῶν
ὑπῆρξεν. — τί ἐν ἐστὶ ἐφ' ὃ δυσαρ-
ρήσαντες κατὰ τὸ παρὸν ἡμῖν, τὰς ἀπο-
σείς ἐποιήσατε; πῶς βέλομαι πυνθεῖν.
δοκῶ μὲν ὃ δ' ἐν ἑστ' ἐρεῖν, ὅτ' ἐπινη-
σεν ὑμῶν εὐδία. καὶ μὴν εὐδία τοῖς ἀπο-
κρινοῖς ἀγαλλοῖσας. πότε γὰρ εὐδία
πρὸς τὰς μετ' ὅρων; ὅτε ὃ πλεονέκτη-
μα γένηται τῇ Ῥώμῃ. — ἀλλ' ἐκ
ἐστὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν εὐδία εὐδ' ἂν ἐχοί-
μεις δίκαιον εὐδ' ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν εἶπαι, ὅτε
περὶ ἡμᾶς ὅτε περὶ τὴν παλαιότητα.
Διότι ἐγὼ περὶ ὑμῶν περὶ τὴν
Ῥώμην καὶ περὶ αὐτὸν ἀπολογίσομαι
— καὶ αὐτὸν τρέπον καὶ τὸ πλε-
ονέκτημα εὐδ' εὐδ' εὐδ' περὶ τὴν ἀρχήν,
οἷος ἂν ἐχοίμεν περὶ τὰς καὶ συμβέ-
λεις.

I wonder what it is that has thus dis-
pleased you, or with what Views you
have contrived this Defection. There
are but three Causes ordinarily, that
make Men rise up against the Church,
and those that have Authority in it; they
are either angry with their Governours,
and are uneasy to be under them, or they
are not pleased with their present Condi-
tion, or they are carried off with great
Expectations of mending their Fortunes;
pray which of these is it? — For what
have you to say against me that should
occasion so great a Disturbance? I would
fain know, because I cannot imagine that
you have any thing to alledge. It cannot
be the present Ill State of the Church, for
when was it ever in a more flourishing
Condition? or when more firmly esta-
blish'd? — It could not be any thing
of this, nor have you any just Cause to
say the least thing against me or the
Church. But I have this Apology to
make for you — People are common-
ly so affected toward their Governours,
as their particular Leaders and Advisers
would have them to be.

Let this Writer well consider this Passage, and it will, if
any thing can, help to dispose him to follow that *Truth*,
which

which he gives such *Encomiums* of, as are easier to him than the Practice of it, but do not recommend it half so effectually as his own Sincerity would.

After his Flourish about *Truth*, he returns to *Ireland*, that Page 32. has furnished him with so many Discoveries where it lay all this while, and appeals to that Kingdom to shew, that the Lower House Claims are as agreeable to *Peace and Order*, as they are to *Right and Truth*. But, by his leave, I do not think there can be yet any sufficient Evidence of that. The Practice there, is as yet very new, and has been hitherto disregarded by the Bishops in great Measure, not approved as he says. And there is great Reason to think, that this Writer having answered so much for them, without any of their Consents, for ought that appears, and against some of their Minds, will oblige them to look into these things a little more narrowly, and not suffer Questions, in which they are so nearly concerned, to be determined without them.

One Bishop of that Kingdom, I am sure, upon the first Application made for a Convocation to be assembled in *Ireland*, expressed himself in a Letter, dated *July 1, 1703*, to one here in *England*, very apprehensive of the Consequences of it, in these Words: *If it be granted, I fear, the Example of yours there, would have too great an Influence upon our Lower House here*; and as Experience has shewn that he was not mistaken, so there is Reason to think, that more of his Brethren are of his Mind. However, this Writer assures us, that *the Bishops there, for this their wise and Fatherly Conduct*, Page 33. *have met with all the Returns of Reverence and Obedience that could possibly be paid them*; which is as true, as most of his other Assertions. I think it appears by the Letter above, that they did not shew any great Reverence in that little Intercourse they had with the Bishops; and their avowing these Claims upon the Upper House, without consulting the Bishops, is, I think, no very proper Instance of their Obedience to them.

It is therefore an unusual Confidence, even in this Writer, to desire my Lords the Bishops here in *England*, to try the same Methods, and to suggest that, if they do not, a Resolution is

taken, and will be pursued, for Reasons, not good to be sure, because of his Gueſſing, either to divide the Clergy among themselves, or to subdue them into an implicate Dependance, and that they have nothing to do, but to refer themselves to the Mercy of God. This, I confess, is a Stroke I am not able to answer, and I hope no indifferent Reader will think there is an Occasion for it.

Page 33.

He cannot end his Book, without giving us another Instance of their attempting to proceed upon Business in the Paper which was passed in the Lower House, Feb. 19. He refers to his Preface, where these Attempts were one of their *Methods of Peace*; and he tells us here, that they pursued it from *the very time that the Rupture happen'd*, Feb. 1; so that I hope it is no very peaceable Method, which is equally suited to *Peace and War*; tho', I confess, it comes in more properly here, considering the ways in which they went upon Business; when, without Power to proceed, it could serve only to cast a Reproach on the Bishops; and there is too much Reason to think, by the Management of it, that it was chiefly intended for this.

There has been so much said upon these Occasions already, that I shall not touch upon any Particular, in this Paper, except what they do in the last place insist on (*viz.*) *some Synodical Notice of the Dishonour done to the Church, by a Sermon preached by Mr. Benjamin Hoadly, &c. containing Positions contrary to the Doctrine of the Church, &c.* This they insist on after they have been told more than once, that no *Synodical Censure* can be passed upon Books or Doctrines, without a *Royal License* at least.

And without entering into the Debate of the general Doctrine therein delivered, at which they seem to be offended, (since it is no part of our Controversy, and the Author himself has endeavoured to shew that it is not contrary to the Church of England,) it should methinks make the Convocation less forward to censure it, to consider the Assistance which Queen Elizabeth gave to the People of Flanders with Approbation here, and that which King James I. gave to those of Holland, for the Approbation of which he required the Convocation, commonly called Bishop Overal's, to meet; and that which King Charles I. gave to the People of Rochell, with

with his Opinion of defensive Arms in those Letters we have in *Welwoods Memoirs*. Welwoods
Memoirs. P.
79. 258.

To these I will add another Instance; which is the more pertinent to the present Case, as it is a Judgment of the Bishops and Clergy in Convocation, afterwards confirmed in Parliament. The occasion of it, was the Assistance given by Queen *Elizabeth* to the *French* Protestants in the 4th year of her Reign; when our Histories tell us, that she took into her Protection the Protestants of *Normandy*, enter'd into a League with the Prince of *Conde*, promis'd Supplies of Money and 6000 Men, and sent over an Army under the Earl of *Warwick*.

The very next year *Elizabeth*, the Bishops and Clergy in Convocation granted a Subsidy to the Queen; and in the Preamble of the Grant, among other Inducements they add this for one: *And finally pondering the inestimable Charges sustained by your Highness, as well of late Days in reducing the Realm of Scotland to Unity and Concord, as also in procuring, as much as in your Highness lieth, by all kind of godly and prudent means, the abating of all Hostility and Persecution within the Realm of France, practised and used against the Professors of God's holy Gospel and true Religion.*

I suppose the Clergy of this Convocation would not have express'd so much Displeasure against Mr. *Hoadly*, had they been to judge him; but the most probable Occasion of this Censure as well as of the Thanks which this last Convocation gave Mr. *Wall* for the Book in which several unjust Reflections were cast on the Bishops, has been upon so good Grounds suggested in the former Account of Proceedings, that I shall say no more of it here: Only I cannot but observe that this Writer concealed as far as he could the Names of the two Members that were sent with the Thanks of the House, whereas in the Acts of it, of which he pretends to give us a Copy, Dr. *Barnett* and Mr. *Rhodes* stand with their Names at length for the honour of that Message; and I will add nothing else to their Names, because they are dead. This Writer perhaps might think it better to conceal them, and that this was an inconsiderable Omission; but certainly it is not agreeable to his pretence of giving us the *Original Acts*; nor can he say that this is according to the Title of his Book faithfully represented.

I must leave the Reader to judge whether this Writer has reason to complain of those Eyes which have been hitherto shut to all Representations of this kind, and those Ears that have been deaf to all the just Complaints of the Clergy, &c. or to hope that his Book will make all the sincere Friends of the Constitution do what in themselves towards closing the Wounds that have too long been kept open and bleeding, or whether this Writer has done it himself.

I cannot help being of the mind, that this Writer has as little to do with Peace, as he has with Truth, and as little right to apply the excellent Passage of Mr. Hooker that way, as he had before to use that of Polybius in the other.

It is very unlucky that the hopes of Peace in Ecclesiastical Controversies, which Mr. Hooker expresses in this Passage, are grounded upon the time of Silence which both Parties have taken willingly to breath; and yet this Writer should break this Silence without any new Provocation, and in a manner that shews his Cause is still handled not without a great mixture of humane Passion and Infirmity.

I have already referred him to one that more belongs to him in that ancient Historian; and I shall conclude as he does with one out of the meek and good Mr. Hooker, which he must very seriously consider before he can pretend to treat these Matters with the calmness and indifference of that truly Christian Writer of Ecclesiastical Polity; who in the Conclusion of his Preface, thus addresses himself to those who opposed themselves:

The best and safest way therefore for you, my dear Brethren, is to call your Deeds past to a new reckoning, to re-examine the Cause ye have taken in hand, and to try it even Point by Point, Argument by Argument; with all the diligent exactness ye can, to lay aside the Gall of that Bitterness wherein your Minds have hitherto overabounded, and with Meekness to search the Truth. Think ye are Men, deem it not impossible for you to err, sift unpartially your own Hearts, whether it be Force of Reason, or Vehemency of Affection, which has seduced, and still does feed these Opinions in you. If Truth do any where manifest itself, seek not to smother it with glozing Beligion, acknowledge the greatness thereof, and think it your best Victory, when the same does prevail over you.

POSTSCRIPT

To the B O O K Entituled,

Partiality Detected.

WHEN I promised, in the Preface to this Book, to retract any Error that I might have committed, as soon as it should be discovered to me, I did not think I should have had any Occasion of performing that Promise. But finding, upon the Intimation of a Friend; that a Mistake has been made, I am most ready to correct that Fault which I did not willingly commit. It had been affirmed to me, that the Sessions upon the seventh and thirteenth of March, 1705, immediately following Her Majesties Letter, communicated March the 1st, were Intermediate Sessions; and as neither my own Memory, nor the Memory of my Friends suggested any thing to the contrary, so the Prorogation upon Writ, March the 21st, helped to keep me from suspecting there were any Sessions in the Upper House between those Days, and consequently from examining the Upper House Book.

Book. This, I confess, I ought to have done, and so much the rather, as I made those two Sessions in the Lower House continued Instances of Disrespect to Her Majesty; a Charge I would not have laid on any of my Brethren, had I so much as doubted the Truth of it.

But I find, upon consulting the Upper House Book, that the Convocation was prorogued by the Archbishop's Commissary, from *March* the first, to the seventh, and so to the thirteenth, and not to the twenty first, as I supposed; so that these two Sessions were, as to this point, regular in the Lower House, and no Dis-respect was shewn by them to Her Majesties Letter; but their returning to sit as a House on that Day, on which it was communicated to them in the Upper House, and the whole Convocation prorogued in Obedience to it, was such a Want of Duty to Her Majesty, as was no more to be justified, than such Intermediate Sessions, had they been held as was too easily supposed.

This Mistake therefore, which does not in the least affect any other Branch of the Cause, does only charge the Members of the Lower House with more Instances of this particular Dis-respect, than were really repeated. But, as it is injurious to some of my Brethren, whom I would not willingly mis-represent in any one Instance, as much as the Bishops and their Friends have been mis-represented by them: I think my self obliged to
do

do them this Justice, and to assure them, that I shall be very industrious to have this Correction go, wherever the Mistake may have gone; having neither Need nor Inclination to support the Cause in which I am engaged, by any Proceeding that can be thought unfair. And as I do not pretend to be above committing a Mistake, so I am not, I thank God, above owning one, when I happen to make it.

FINIS.

do then this Justice, and to assure that I
shall be very industrious to have this Correction
go wherever the Mistake may have gone; hav-
ing neither Need nor Reason to suppose the
Case in which I am charged by any Proceed-
ing that can be thought of. And as I do not
pretend to be above committing a Mistake, so I
am not I thank God, above owning one when I
happen to make it.

